

PAKISTAN

~~AND~~

MUSLIM INDIA

With a Foreword by Qaid-i-Azam,
Mr. M. A. JINNAH,
President
The All-India Muslim League

HOME STUDY CIRCLE,
Malabar Hill, Bombay.

PAKISTAN

AND

MUSLIM INDIA

With a Foreword by Qaid-i-Azam,

Mr. M. A. JINNAH,

President

The All-India Muslim League

HOME STUDY CIRCLE,

Malabar Hill, Bombay.

FOREWORD

by

Qaid-i-Azam Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah

India of modern conception with its so-called present geographical unity is entirely the creation of the British who hold it as one administrative unit by a system of bureaucratic government whose ultimate sanction is the sword and not the will or the sanction of the people behind the government so established. This position is very much exploited by the Hindu Congress and another Hindu organisation, the Hindu Mahasabha. India is a vast sub-continent. It is neither a country nor a nation. It is composed of nationalities and races, but the two major nations are the Muslims and the Hindus. Talk of Indian unity as one central constitutional government of this vast sub-continent is simply a myth.

The differences in India between the two major nations, the Hindus and the Muslims, are a thousand times greater when compared with the continent of Europe. In fact the diversity of its races, religions, cultures and languages has no parallel in any other part of the world; but fortunately the Muslim homelands are in the North Western and Eastern zones of the sub-continent where they are in a solid

majority with a population of nearly 70 millions and they desire that these parts should be separated from the rest of India and constituted into independent sovereign states. The Muslims stand unequivocally for their own freedom and independence and also that of Hindus and the Hindu India in the sub-continent of India, whereas the Hindu machinations and all proposals and schemes suggested by them are intended and calculated to bring a hundred million Muslims under the subjugation and hegemony of the Hindu Raj over the entire

PREFACE BY THE AUTHOR.

The present book is a collection of articles dealing with Muslim case for Pakistan and its various aspects. Part one supports Muslim demand for Pakistan; part two discusses the minority problem the territorial limits and economic position, of the proposed Pakistan States; part three answers criticism from such responsible persons as Babu Ramdial Parshad, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir Radha Krishnan, and Sir N. R. Sirkat.

CONTENTS

PART I PAKISTAN

1. Federation or Separation 1
Two Muslim zones—conflict of political and economic interests—Punjab Muslims' parallel with Turks—divergence in social systems—Muslim opposition to Congress nationalism—arguments against separation considered.
2. What is Pakistan? 13
Origin of Pakistan idea—basic principles of Pakistan movement—Justification for N. W. Muslim zone.
3. Right to Self-determination 23
Minority problem in Europe—weak states cannot be denied independence—Muslims are not a minority—they are a majority in two zones.
4. The Issue of Independence 30
Meaning of independence—Congress wants capitalist Democracy—foreign policy under Congress—expansion and migration—alliance with Russia and China to suppress Muslim minorities—nationalism turns aggressive as in Italy—industries will become a Hindu monopoly—lot of minorities will be worsened—

CONTENTS

Pakistan strikes at the root of vested interests
—why Cripps' proposals were rejected.

Confederation is Impossible 47
Need of territorial readjustment --the League
suggestion- the compromise plan--U.S.A.
analogy is inapplicable to India--confederat-
ion as an experiment Punjab Premier's
zonal scheme--C. R. Reddy's Scheme -
Federation cannot be imposed.

PART II PROBLEMS OF PAKISTAN.

1. Pakistan and the Sikhs 87
India in the past—India under Muslims—
India prior to British rule—the Mahrattas—
lessons from the past-minority problem in
Europe—minorities in Europe prior to 1919—
lessons for Sikhs from other countries—
Punjab's real interests demand separation.
2. The League Solution 99
The Lahore Resolution—its criticisms—the
Mahasabha and Congress schemes—democra-
cy presupposes a homogeneous nation—Lea-
gue resolution reduces minority problem to
narrow limits—safeguards cannot satisfy a
majority—partition will not worsen the lot
of minorities.
3. North Western Muslim zone 108
Population according to 1921 census—com-
munity wise proportion after the exclusion of
Ambala Division and some states—the Hin-
du case—the Sikh case and S. Ujjal Singh's
scheme—safeguards for Sikhs—future of
native states in the zone.
4. The Eastern Muslim Zone 118
Area and population—advantages of Eastern
Pakistan State over the Western State—a
special disadvantage—district-wise popula-
tion of Bengal and Assam—minorities.

CONTENTS

The Economic Position	127
Some important figures—Pakistan and other leading Muslim States—problem of deficit provinces—Sindh, N. W. F. Province and Baluchistan—Central and Provincial subjects—expenditure on Defence—prospects of Eastern Pakistan State—economic resources—industry and trade.	

PART III GENERAL CRITICISMS

Pakistan and India's Defence	140
Will Pakistan weaken India's defence? insistence on <i>strategical frontiers</i> leads to aggression—real security lies in the co-operation of nations Pakistan will not lead to religious wars—Pakistan, a check on Hindu Imperialism.	

Rajen Babu's Rejoinder to Mr. Jinnah	147
--------------------------------------	-----

I

The two points raised by Mr. Jinnah—Mr. Jinnah states his case—Rajen Babu's evasive reply—Lahore Resolution suggests possible territorial limits—Rajen Babu follows Mr. Amrey in the line of his argument—doubts financial stability of Muslim states—recruitment of minorities in the army—reciprocal treatment of minorities

II.

case of Sudetan Germans—Rajen Babu has no faith in safeguards—example of Muslim

countries is inapplicable—interference from foreign powers is no argument to deprive a country of its independence

III.

Rajen Babu wants to know the resources of Pakistan—example of European countries—how the minority problem was solved in Europe.

3. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's Opposition 172
To Pakistan Scheme

I.

Mr. Amery's advice—responsibility for deadlock—who will keep India's peace—18th century analogy inapplicable—India's unity is maintained by the British bayonet—Pakistan, not a black treachery

II.

Verdict of a political philosopher—when has a majority the right to impose its will—British rule has not created a national State—two criticisms of Mr. Sapru—Dr. Ambedkar's testimony.

4. The North West Frontier Bogey 186
Mr. Sanadhi's distrust of the Pathan—the Frontier question—Afghanistan's position—Hindu exploitation of N. W. F. Province. Political and economic aspects of the frontier problem—Pathan awakening—Gandhian attempt to emasculate the Pathan exposed.

CONTENTS

Sir Radhakrishnan on India's Unity	194
His theory and facts—India's unity never existed in the past—India under Asoka—extent of Asoka's empire—Unity efforts—vivisection of India in the past—India's disunity led to conquests—failure of Mahrattas to establish unity. India under Muslims—presents conception of unity—effect of nationalism—Muslim consent essential—Indian problem is international.	

Sir N. R. Sirkar on Freedom	204
Will freedom lead to India's unity?—fallacy of the argument—Italy's example - Picture of India in 1887—lack of cultural unity leads to disintegration—India not a homogeneous state—fundamental differences of the two major communities—efforts to mislead British Government—inconsistency of argument - Hindu attitude.	

PART I

PAKISTAN.

1. Federation or Separation

The most important political question before a Muslim is whether his interests can best be served by an assurance of "full protection of his religion, culture and language" on the part of the Congress, or a complete separation and independence of those parts of India where Muslims form a majority.

If the first alternative is accepted, the 90 millions of Muslims will once for all be reduced to the position of a minority and will have to depend upon the good-will and amity of the majority community for the protection of their interests.

No one would have objected to this result if the Muslim population of India had actually been scattered in all the provinces and had not been strong enough to form an independent stable government in any part. But as facts stand, two-thirds of the Muslim population in India is concentrated in their majority provinces and one-third in minority provinces. They number 28 millions in the North-West out of a total population of 42 millions in the five adjoining areas of the Punjab, Kashmir, Sind, the Frontier Province and Baluchistan. The proportion of Muslim population can further be

raised by a readjustment of the eastern frontier of the Punjab.

In Bengal, too, like the Punjab, a readjustment of frontiers will raise the Muslim proportion in population to 70 per cent or more. At present the Muslims form an overwhelming majority of 75 per cent in Eastern Bengal and the Goalpara and Sylhet districts of Assam. They are also a majority in some districts of Western Bengal which are contiguous to Eastern Bengal. If this Muslim population is joined together so as to come under a new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, the Muslims will be placed in a permanent majority of 70 per cent in a total population of 40 millions.

majorities and minorities, they are also politically, economically and socially divided. The Muslim has distinct political aspirations which urge him on to the political regeneration of his own community as well as of the Muslim world in general. He does not view with the same interest the progress of non-Muslim countries as he watches that of a Muslim country. His first concern is with the rise of Islam as a political power in the world. This ambition, he conceives, not with a view to suppress the liberties of other nations, but simply because he feels that the establishment of the political power of Islam will bring about a better standard of justice and equality between nations and individuals.

He still believes that if Islam had been the dominant religion in Europe, the world would not have seen the rise of a narrow and aggressive form of nationalism which has dragged the whole world into a state of chaos and disorder.

The Hindu, on the other hand, has no ultra-territorial interests. All his activities are confined to India and he has no real cultural or religious link with any other country beyond India. The fate of China or Japan cannot be of such interest to a Hindu as that of Turkey or Afghanistan to a Muslim.

Differences in political aspirations in the past, when Muslims and Hindus assumed the role of the rulers and the ruled, have further deepened the political divergence of the two communities. The Muslim still looks with fervour to his glorious past

and is only interested in independence in so far as it can assist him directly in regaining the political power lost by him. The Hindu, too, breathes deep in the ancient past when he dominated the continent of India and enjoyed undivided political power.

Economically, too, there is a clash between Hindu and Muslim interests. There are certain occupations entirely reserved for Hindus and the Muslims have been completely shut out of them. Shop-keeping in general is a monopoly of the Hindu even in purely Muslim areas. The grain and cloth markets in particular in every city are controlled by Hindus. Even in villages which lie in pure Muslim surroundings, the Hindu holds a favoured position as a money-lender or shopkeeper. The Muslim middle class in cities has no choice left except to work as labourers or to seek petty jobs in Government service. The Hindu middle class is prosperous and flourishing and controls all the internal and external trade of the country.

The Muslims cannot look upon this state of affairs as *a fait accompli*. Nor can they accept forever the condition of being a debtor community. All their hard-earned savings pass into the hands of the Hindu money-lender in the form of the interest, which in the Punjab alone is ten times the land revenue of the Province.

Another danger to which Muslims are exposed is the peaceful penetration of the Hindu shop-keeper in purely Muslim areas. The Hindu has no landed interests in the Western Punjab, the Frontier

Province and Sind, and yet he forms a majority in all the towns and dominates the entire public life.

This alone accounts for the fact that in a city like Bannu which lies in the heart of a Muslim district, the Hindus form over 70 per cent of its population and monopolise the entire trade and all the professions. Of the 2,000 odd shops in the city there are hardly a dozen Muslim shops.

The economic condition of the Muslims in the Punjab is exactly like that of the Turks in their homeland of Asia Minor prior to the regeneration of Modern Turkey. Though the Turk had ruled over Asia Minor for over 800 years, and formed the majority of its population, yet economically he stood no comparison with the subject peoples like the Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. All internal and foreign trade and all the learned professions, such as medicine, teaching and banking, were monopolised by non-Turkish races. The Turk, like the Punjabi Muslim, was either a peasant sunk deep in debt or was content to work as a soldier or a Government servant.

Nothing but a revolution was needed to change the economical condition of the Turk. This was accomplished by Mustapha Kemal, who stopped non-Turkish immigration into purely Turkish villages and cities and started with State help various commercial enterprises to encourage the Turk, to undertake banking and trading. Now in course of 25 years the Turk is commercially most efficient in his homeland, and the Turkish peasant is

no longer in the grips of the Armenian or Jewish moneylender.

Can we expect this of a future Indian Government under Congress domination—that it will try to bring the Muslims into line with the Hindu community, which at present holds the sole monopoly of trade and commerce in cities and villages and possesses wealth and influence out of all proportion to its numerical strength? The interests of the Muslim peasant as well as of the Muslim middle class man in the city directly clash with those of the Hindu money-lender and shop-keeper. The Muslims cannot trust that the very community, which is at present responsible for their economic enslavement, will do justice to them, the moment it gains political power. On the contrary their fears are intensified by the realisation that a concentration of political and economic power in the hands of a hostile community will make their condition politically and economically worse than at present.

privileges or rights for them except what they can claim as part of the Hindu Polity.

It is common knowledge that the working of Hindu social system in the past has led to the concentration of all economic and social power in the hands of high-caste Hindus. This cannot be said of Islam. The Muslims believe in the equality and fraternity of all. Inter-dining and inter-marrying are not obstacles among the various classes of Muslims. They believe in the equality of all before law and recognise no distinction between one Muslim and another on the basis of birth and blood.

Such indeed is the divergence in social systems of the two communities that on occasions of common social gathering when these differences are expected to be minimised, they present themselves in more striking forms. A Muslim attending a Hindu public dinner or party will miss badly, things suited to his taste and will find most of the dishes prepared according to Hindu practice. In a railway journey, when opportunities of contact are of daily occurrence, the question of food and drink still divides the Hindu from the Muslim. In cities, in building a new house or taking an old one on rent, a Hindu will more readily see the company of a Hindu neighbour. In fact in every walk of life, a Muslim is more welcome to a Muslim and a Hindu to a Hindu.

In view of this conflict of interest in the political, economic and social field, besides that of religion it is not an easy task to reconcile the interests of a Muslim to those of Hindu nationalism

which aims at the possession of supreme control of all political power of India. Protection of religion, language and culture is out of the question where a minority can be easily converted into a permanent majority by a readjustment of geographical frontiers.

Undoubtedly, the Muslims in Hindu-majority provinces are a real minority and have no other alternative but to accept Congress assurances of goodwill for their future but they are not bound by any such consideration to leave their ultimate political and economic interests in provinces where they are a majority, to the mercy of a hostile Hindu majority at the Centre.

The question is often asked, if Muslim interests are safeguarded in their minority provinces and are already protected in their majority provinces by their own preponderant numerical strength, why do they not accept the lead of the Congress and its ideal of a common Indian nationality? The answer to this question requires a real understanding of what is meant by independence. When a nation aspires for independence, it seeks to have full power to decide all questions affecting the multifarious activities of a modern State. It does not simply want self-government as understood in a limited sense, but supreme control of all national organs of the State, including defence, foreign affairs, finance, communications, etc.

Now it is a simple conclusion that if the Muslim Provinces remain part of a future Indian National State, they will undoubtedly enjoy a

limited kind of provincial autonomy but the final voice in the army, navy, air force and other important central subjects will be held by a Central Cabinet responsible to a Central Legislature which will be dominated by a Hindu Majority. Unless the Muslims are assured of some special advantages which they will obtain if they remain content with limited provincial autonomy in their majority provinces, there is no other consideration which can persuade or compel them to accept the majority rule at the centre.

In fact, the Muslims are convinced that by forming part of a single composite nation in India, they will be losers all round and will finally sink to the position of a helpless minority which will be shorn of all final power in the supreme executive affairs of the Centre. It is for the Congress to convince the Muslims how they are going to benefit by Hindu domination at the Centre.

The arguments so far advanced against the proposed scheme of separation have been unconvincing. It is said that the proposed Muslim States in the North-West and North-East will be cut off from one another by Hindu India and will be in permanent danger of opposition from the latter due to its immense power in men and resources. Secondly, the Muslim States will not be in a position to find money to defend their frontiers and will break down under military pressure from the Frontier tribes or countries beyond the Frontier. Thirdly, the Muslim States will not be able to

develop themselves industrially as Hindu capital will not find an easy access in them. Finally the non-Muslim minorities will be a source of constant trouble to Muslim States and will ever be on the look out for a favourable opportunity to secede from them.

I reply these arguments one by one. As to the first that the Muslim States will be helpless against Hindu India which will isolate them from each other, the simple reply is that mere numbers do not count in the defence of a modern State. The fate of China with its teeming population of 400 millions is a clear instance in point. So far as military traditions go, Muslim areas particularly the provinces of the North-West, are far stronger than Hindu India. This fact is even admitted by Mr. Gandhi, who says in a recent article in the "Harijan" that if the British leave India to-day, the Punjabis and Gurkhas will overrun the country. Besides the Muslim States will enter into a permanent alliance with other Muslim countries of South-Western Asia and will thus preserve the balance of power evenly between Hindu India and Muslim States.

The second argument that the proposed Muslim States will be financially poor to defend their frontiers ignores the fact that the North West Frontier will lose all importance once a Muslim State is established in the North-West. The tribesmen and the people beyond the North West Frontier are all Muslims. They will lose all

religious and political fervour for Jihad against non-Muslims, once they find that they have to reckon with their brothers in Islam. If the frontier between Afghanistan and Persia or that between Persia and Turkey can be easily defended by comparatively small armies, there is no reason why the same should not be possible in case of the frontiers between Afghanistan and Muslim North-West.

Again the resources of the new Muslim State in men and money will be far stronger than those of Afghanistan or independent tribes beyond the Frontier Province and hence it will experience no great difficulty in keeping peace and order on its side of the frontier.

The third argument that the Muslim States will acquire capital from Hindu India to be developed industrially is entirely wrong. A modern country, which can maintain peace and order within its bounds and can guarantee payment of debt, can invite capital from foreign countries. The example of Turkey can be easily followed. If the State Government in Turkey can patronise and finance industries with the help of foreign capital, the Muslim States in India can adopt similar methods.

The Muslims do not want that they should lose the major share of profits in business by leaving all initiative and control in industrial development to Hindu capitalists of Hindu India. They will rather prefer that the State should organise and promote industries and find work for the large number of workless people in cities and villages.

The fourth argument that the non-Muslim minorities will be a source of constant danger to the stability of Muslim States will lose all importance in face of the preponderance of Muslim voice in the Government. Both in the North-West and the North East, with adjustments in frontiers, the proportion of the Muslim population will be raised to 80 per cent and the minorities will be reduced to 20 per cent. These minorities will be given full protection in regard to their religion, language and culture like the Muslim minorities in Hindu India, and will no longer cause unnecessary annoyance to Muslim governments for fear of provoking Muslim minorities in Hindu India to similar action.

As a matter of fact the existence of minorities both in Hindu India and Muslim States will make it possible for them to adopt a common line of action and to restore confidence among the minorities which will thus be finally reconciled to their lot.

2. *What is Pakistan*

It is commonly misunderstood that Pakistan scheme was originated by Mr. Jinnah and that the idea was not entertained till the Viceroy had announced the scheme for the expansion of his Executive Council. The Pakistan idea was first conceived by Sayed Jamalud Din Afghani, an old Muslim patriot of worldfame. Subsequently, it owed inspiration to late Sir Mohammad Iqbal who in his Presidential Address to the All-India Muslim League in 1930 proposed the amalgamation of the North-Western Muslim Provinces into a single state. Thereafter the idea was given a definite shape by a highly cultured Punjabi, Ch. Rahmat Ali who is popularly known to have coined the word Pakistan to denote the North-Western Muslim part of India. The choice of the word should not be considered provocative as it is merely an artificial contrivance to express a common name for the five units which make up Pakistan. The letter P stands for the Punjab, A for the Afghan Province which is otherwise called N. W. F. Province, K represents Kashmir, S symbolises Sind and the last three letters TAN signify Baluchistan. The word Pakistan in Urdu is made up of 7 letters as against 8 in English ; hence the confusion for leaving letter I unrepresented. Those who object to the word Pakistan as being repugnant to their ears, and feel that it implies Muslim Raj ou

and out, may use some other appropriate word in its place such as Industan or Sindhistan after the name of the river Indus in English or Sindh in Urdu, but they have no right to force the majority community in Pakistan to discard the word in favour of a new one at their dictation. The Muslim masses in the absence of a better word which can express the union of their five majority areas cannot be induced to give it up. The Muslims in Hindu India form an important minority, and the word Hindustan is generally understood to mean the land of Hindus; yet they have never objected to its use. The Sikhs and other minorities in Pakistan should rest satisfied that their interests will be properly safeguarded in consultation with them and they will not be subjected to laws of Islamic Shariat.

The Lahore Resolution of the League does not specifically mention the word Pakistan though there is no gainsaying the fact that it has furnished the real basis for Pakistan movement. Mr. Jinnah deserves credit for giving a wider scope and significance to the word Pakistan which so far was confined to Muslim North West. As interpreted by him, Pakistan now implies a scheme of political division of India which aims at the separation of the predominant Muslim areas in the North-West and North-East from the rest of India and guarantees to minorities both in Muslim and Hindu India full protection of their political, economical, cultural and religious rights on a reciprocal basis. It is evident that Pakistan idea has developed under the

guidance of Mr. Jinnah from an exclusive Muslim ideal to a political scheme which claims justice and fair-play for majorities as well as minorities in the sub-continent of India.

Pakistan is no longer a mere religious slogan of the Muslims. It is an anchor-sheet of their national aspirations. The idea has grown into a movement and has taken firm root in the Muslim mind. It will be worthwhile to know the basic principles which have popularised the Pakistan movement among the Muslims:—

1. The Muslims have become conscious of the fact that they form a separate nation by themselves and that they cannot lose their identity under any circumstances to merge into the so called 'nationalism' which is not only opposed to the best interests of Islam but is also foreign to the conception of Hindu religion and Society, based on caste system and exclusive social customs.

2. The Muslims are alive to their importance as a major large community of India which forms a majority in 4 out of 11 Provinces. Their population strength of 90 millions is far too big to relegate them to the position of a minority. There is no example in history where a people numerically so strong have ever been assigned the role of a permanent minority and denied their sovereign rights in the name of nationalism.

3. The Muslims claim that they have every right to share full and independent sovereign power

in proportion to their population strength and cannot be deprived of their due share of power on any ground.

4. The Muslims realise that they are not a minority in the sense as minorities are found in other countries. They are mainly concentrated in two distinct zones in the North-West and North-East of India which are their homelands, and which represent two-thirds of their total population in India.

5. The Muslims are aware that India is a sub-continent which is inhabited by one fifth of the world's total population and that its present political unity is solely held by the British bayonet. Division on the principle of self-determination is the final solution which appeals to their imagination.

6. The Muslims recognise that democracy of the Western type is not suited to Indian conditions, that the majorities and minorities in the sub-continent of India will always be reflected on the basis of religion and that in a scheme of United India there will be the permanent danger of Hindus remaining in power at the centre and doing incalculable harm to their interests in general.

7. The Muslims have learnt from past experience that the Congress has done nothing so far to win Muslim good will and has secretly been laying plans to disrupt Muslim solidarity and to crush political awakening among them.

The adoption of Gandhian philosophy as a political creed by the Congress and its immediate results such as Non-Violence, Wardah Scheme of Education, Harijan uplift, promotion of Hindi language, Muslim mass contact campaign etc. have convinced the Muslims that Congress is aiming a death blow at Muslim political thought and is working for the regeneration and revival of the old Hindu civilisation and culture.

It is evident from the above that Muslims have welcomed the Pakistan movement not with the object of suppressing the political rights of non-Muslims living in Hindu Provinces nor of minorities living under them. Their political demands are strictly limited by two main principles. (1). The Muslims claim sovereign rights over a part of India and not the whole on the basis of their population strength as a nation of 90 millions (2) They are prepared to extend to minorities under them all such privileges as will be allowed to Muslim minorities in Hindu provinces.

Apart from the general ideas underlying the Pakistan movement, the Muslims in the North-Western zone have been influenced by many other factors justifying their claim for separation. Some of the arguments that are often given in support of their case are mentioned below :-

(1). The people of Pakistan differ from the rest of India in religion, race, and language, and possess all the necessary essentials which go to form a nation. Among themselves, the Muslims.

Hindus and Sikhs have more in common than they have with the people living in the rest of India. In religion, the Sikhs and the Arya Smajists have more identical views on the unity of God and belief in a revealed religion than with the Hindus elsewhere. By race, the people belong to the same Aryan stock while Urdu with its Persian script is treated as the court language throughout this area. Untouchability, the caste system, music before the mosque and cow protection do not present such difficult problems as in the rest of India.

(2) The Muslims and Sikhs will be quite helpless minorities in a bigger India where their interests will not be properly safeguarded at the centre on account of the preponderance of Hindu influence. In Pakistan, however, there will be no danger that the Muslims or Sikhs will lose their culture as they have lived together for centuries and understand each other's view point. Moreover, their economic interests have become so much inter-dependent, that they cannot think of doing harm to each other.

(3) Pakistan has always maintained its separate position from the rest of India in the past. During the Hindu period, it was never subjected to a Hindu empire beyond its frontiers. Under Chandragupta, it formed part of his empire for a short period, but the Gupta and Harsha empires never extended beyond the Jumna. During the Rajput period, it was governed by its own Rajs. Under

Muslim kings, Pakistan maintained its distinct position as the mainstay of their power and was marked out from the rest of India beyond the Jumna, which was called Hindustan. Prior to its conquest by the British, Pakistan had regained its separate identity first under the Afghans and afterwards under the Sikhs. India as it exists at present is a British creation and never existed in the past with its present bounds and limit.

(4) Pakistan is a natural region occupying the basin of the Indus and its tributaries which flow in a direction opposite to those of the rest of India. It has a separate drainage system.

(5) Its climate and geographical conditions have given the people distinct characteristics of their own. The people differ from those in the rest of India in physical features, complexion, dress, mode of living and social customs.

(6) It has a separate railway system known as the North Western Railway, which has its branches spread all over. The entire volume of its foreign trade, both imports and exports, passes through Karachi which is connected with all the important towns by means of railways. In fact, Karachi is far more important for every town in Pakistan than a seaport in any other part of India can be. Without Karachi, Pakistan will not be able to maintain its economic independence.

(7) The economic interests of Pakistan clash with the rest of India. Pakistan is mainly an

agricultural area which exports corn, raw cotton, oil seeds, hides and skins and imports manufactured goods and machinery. Both in respect of imports and exports Pakistan must have far greater relations with Europe than with the rest of India. Pakistan's best customers will be at least for some time in Europe, from whom it will have to buy in return manufactured articles. A policy of free trade will be in the interests of both the consumers as well as producers, until such time as 'Pakistan' starts its own industries.

But by remaining part of India, Pakistan will be at the mercy of the factory owners of Bombay, Ahmedabad and Cawnpore who will influence the Indian Government to adopt a policy of protection, which will necessitate the imposition of heavy taxes upon imports and the subsidising of their concerns. The result of this policy will be that Pakistan will be forced to buy Indian goods without being given any chance of its own industrialisation while its peasantry will be starved for not finding ready markets for the sale of its raw materials. It is for this reason that Mr. Calvert in his book on 'Wealth and Welfare' could recommend on the part of Pakistan to join a Federation at the Centre.

(8) Pakistan is the home of martial race who can defend their liberties against any foreign aggression. In no other part of India, where traditions play such an important part in creating the people a sense of pride and superiority in their physical strength and in developing their moral spirit.

(9) Pakistan is big enough to form a strong national State. It is twice the size of France and equal to Italy in population. It satisfies the necessary conditions for the growth of nationalism which requires for its success a population neither too big nor too small spread over a sufficient area. The immensity of population and the vastness of area of a country is rather a weakness than a source of strength, as the example of China shows.

(10) Pakistan possesses enough resources in land, forests and mines which when developed will provide subsistence for double or treble its present population. In other parts of India the population has reached the limits of congestion which can only be relieved through emigration, but Pakistan is free from such dangers. It is however, jealous of safeguarding its lands against forced immigration from the rest of India, which may be resorted to if it forms part of India.

(11) By securing complete independence the people of Pakistan will have full control over what are called the vital organs of a modern State i.e., the army, the navy, foreign relations, trade and commerce posts and telegraphs, communications, customs and taxation.

(12) An independent Pakistan will win over the Frontier tribes by economic concessions and conciliatory measures and will further hold friendly relations with Afghanistan and other States of S.W. Asia. This will obviate the necessity of keeping a very big army on the Frontier and will save the

enormous military expenditure as incurred at present. If Afghanistan and Persia or again Persia and Turkey can afford to have small armies to defend their frontiers, there is no reason why Pakistan should be required to keep a very large army to defend its frontiers.

(13) With the creation of Pakistan as an independent State, revenues from customs and income-tax, which at present go into the Central Treasury, will be added to Pakistan's income. These two sources will be sufficient to meet expenditure on defence and to back up the deficit provinces i.e. the Frontier Province and Baluchistan.

3. Right to Self-Determination

Times out of number it has been declared by the Muslim League that the Muslims are not a minority in India in the sense in which small minorities exist in some other independent states. In Europe, prior to the present war, the minority problem had been practically settled, and a formula devised after the last Great War which recognised a clear distinction between a minority as a nation, entitled to full sovereign rights of an independent state, and a minority as a sub-national group which was to be granted safeguards for the protection of its religion, language and culture. The main idea underlying this formula was that a minority which occupies a compact part of territory with well-defined limits, and can be converted into a real and effective majority by a reasonable adjustment of geographical frontiers, should be conceded the rights of an independent national State.

The minority problem then existed in a very acute form in the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary, in European Russia and the Turkish Empire. The Statesmen of Europe who were responsible for the post-war settlement met in a series of conferences and drew up an elaborate procedure to define and clarify the complexity of the issue on the minority question.

A dozen new States were brought into existence, some of which were even too weak to

defend themselves and were not separated from other States by historical or effective geographical frontiers. On the ruins of Austria-Hungary, the new States of Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, and Hungary were created while Rumania and Serbia were enlarged by the addition of territories inhabited by their own kinsmen. A chain of five new States was formed on the western border of European Russia which practically cut off the latter from access to the West, both by sea and land. The States of Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland occupied the entire western borders of Russia with the exception of a small part of the subcoast round Leningrad. The important seaports of Riga and Helsingfors passed out of Russian hands.

The Bolsheviki, who had then come into power in Czarist Russia, showed great magnanimity of spirit by recognising all the new States and guaranteeing their independence. It was only when it became apparent that Germany was secretly conspiring to get a foothold in Finland and to launch a possible attack on Russia from the North, that the Bolsheviki were forced to declare war on Finland. Even then the public opinion of the world found no justification in the Bolshevik plea for invasion and condemned them as aggressors.

I do not want to enter here into the discussion whether the European statesmen after the last Great War were justified in creating a number of new States without giving them protection against

their powerful neighbouring States of Germany and Russia. Those who think that the splitting up of Central Europe gave Germany a free hand to interfere in its internal affairs, ignore the essential fact that the rise of Germany under Hitler is an abnormal factor in the History of the world.

The principle of self-determination which was expected to liberate a dozen national minorities, together numbering over 80 millions, could not be withheld simply because the liberated States were too weak to stand on their legs and could not defend themselves against their powerful neighbours. If this point is carried to its logical conclusion then no weak State deserves to retain its independence. Physically, it is possible that it will be forcibly annexed by its stronger neighbour, but this will not be considered a permanent solution of the difficulty, and sooner or later, when the aggressor state is involved in trouble either through external war or internal revolution, the people of the annexed State will seek the first opportunity to rise in arms and declare their independence.

We all admit that France with her population half that of Germany will never be able to defend herself from German aggression without the help of powerful allies. The present war has fully proved this. But that does not imply that France has forfeited her right to independent existence.

Some people suggest that weak States should combine to form federations for common defence,

but here too they ignore the fact that it is again possible that some federations may grow far stronger than their neighbouring States or even federations and thus constitute a danger for the latter.

Imagine for example the Muslim States of Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan forming a federation for the sole purpose of defence. Can it be said with certainty that these four States, even when combined, can face successfully a united and strong Russia under a dictatorial regime? Federation or no federation, whenever there is an abnormal factor in the world history and some nations grow aggressive and imperialist, they are bound to come into conflict with other states. The only safeguard for the peace and tranquility of the world is to recognise the right of every nation for self-determination. Once this principle is frankly conceded and is applied to the enslaved peoples all over the world, there will be an end of all wars, inspired by a desire for conquest or expansion.

The Atlantic Charter guarantees the right of European and American States for independent existence, but if it is amended and replaced by a Pacific charter which should recognize the right of every nation in Asia to determine its own future, much illwill and mistrust which at present divide the White from the Black will disappear. If Asia and Africa, the two continents which at present are dominated by Imperialist Powers, are liberated from their yoke, the world will be saved for peace for ever.

Unfortunately, the Congress nationalists of India, who are imperialists to the core in their political notions do not concede the principle of self-determination to a nation of 90 millions that accidentally happens to be a minority in a sub-continent which in the past knew no political unity and which was for the first time forcibly united at the point of the British bayonet. There is no example in the world where a community as big as the entire population of Germany has ever been content with the status of a minority. There is further no example where a minority has such fundamental differences with the majority as the Muslims of India have with the Hindus.

The Portuguese and the Spaniards, the Dutch and the Belgians, the Swedes and the Norwegians have lived together respectively under united kingdoms in the past ; their countries are separated by no real geographical frontiers and form a natural whole ; the people are allied by religion, race and common out-look on life. Yet he will be a mere dreamer who can predict a united State for the Portuguese and Spaniards in the Iberian Peninsula, for the Dutch and the Belgians in the Netherlands and for the Swedes and Norwegians in Scandenavia.

The Muslims of India now form more than one-fourth of the total population of 360 millions, but even if they were a minority of 3 millions in the total population and that minority had been concentrated in one compact part of India, say Sind, no excuse would have been considered sufficient to

deprive them of the right to independent existence, had they so desired.

Fortunately for the Muslims, they are effective majorities in two distinct parts of India in the North-West and North-East. If there is any region in the vast sub-continent of India, which stands out prominent as a separate part of India in view of its natural frontiers, drainage system racial and religious affinities of the people, it is the Indus Basin Region.

It is fertilised by the river Indus and its five tributaries and is bounded on the south by the deserts of Rajputana and on the east by the Jumna river. It has a separate railway system known as the North-Western Railway which connects all important towns with its exclusive seaport of Karachi. The problems concerning its irrigation system, development of roads and railways, encouragement of agriculture and industry, defence of strategic frontiers and promotion of trade with countries of the Middle East and many more are such that it is no concern of the people of the rest of India to interfere with them. If the Congress idealists can work to see the whole of India grow into a single national State, it is still more practicable and sound to see a truly homogeneous and compact part of India grow into a strong national State.

If the Bolshevicks of Russia could guarantee the independent existence of five States on the western side of European Russia and bring all economical and strategical advantage which the

incorporation of these States into Russia could secure them, what prevents the Congress nationalists from recognising the justice of the Muslim claims? The time is bound to come when the force of reason will have its way and an independent Muslim India will be a settled fact.

4. *The Issue of Independence*

The Hindus say that the demand for Pakistan will delay the independence of India indefinitely and that unless the Muslims give it up unconditionally, there is no hope for the people of India to attain the status of an independent nation. The Muslims on the other hand say with equal emphasis that they cannot be a party to the independence of Congress conception as it implies merely a change of masters and will not only lead to a further tightening of their bonds of slavery but will bring Hindu interests into open conflict with those of Muslims in India as well as beyond India. It is evident from the obviously conflicting views of the two communities that there is real confusion as to the ultimate aim of independence.

Before going into details, let us define first what is meant by India's independence. Different interpretations have been given to the word by political or communal organisations in India. Free Islam in a Free India is often defined to be the goal of Muslim India. The Congress which claims to represent India as a whole but which in fact does not carry with it the vast majority of Indian Muslims and large sections of Hindus and other minorities are actually split up on this question into two important groups. The Leftist drive for independence from entirely different motives from those of the

Rightists. The former aim at the establishment of a future Government on Soviet lines where emphasis will be laid on a class war between the upper and lower orders of the Indian society. Their views do not command the support of the general body of Congress men and so we leave them out of account. The Rightists dominate the Congress at present and represent its real opinion. They believe in complete independence with a constitution based on the Capitalist Democratic System of the West. They claim full control for India over all its internal and external affairs, severance of all connections with the British Empire and Indianisation of all services including the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. They want to see an Indian Army manned by Indian officers defending the land frontiers and an Indian Navy under Indian seamen patrolling the Indian Ocean. They will like to have a Central Legislature, elected on adult franchise vested with supreme political power. They will apply the democratic principle of deciding all questions by a majority vote in the Centre as well as in the Provinces.

The Muslims, they profess, will be provided with safeguards for the protection of their religion, language and culture, but for all political and economic questions, they will be considered as part and parcel of the Indian nation and hence will not be entitled to claim special representation of their interests. The principle of communal representation in legislatures and services as well as the Communal Award, as actually in force at present,

will be accepted as a temporary measure for a limited period. Ultimately, the various communities of India will be welded into a single coherent nation where all problems will be considered from the Indian point of view and Hindus and Muslims as such will lose all importance.

Let us see how this scheme of Congress democracy as visualised by the Rightists will apply to India in actual practice. Under the system of adult franchise all communities will be represented in Provincial and Central Legislatures on the basis of their population. The Hindus will command 70% of the voting strength at the Centre and will outnumber the Muslims by three to one or even more. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will be manned by all the communities, but the Hindu element will preponderate. The Muslims and Sikhs of the North West will lose their present privileged position in the army. They supply at present more than 50% of the recruits to the Indian army, but under the Congress scheme of India, their quota will be fixed at 1/10th of the whole or less. The Congress will use its influence through the Central Legislature to control all defence services as well as to exert a check on Provincial Legislature. Finance, Communications, Customs, Posts and Telegraphs, and Foreign Affairs, being all Central Subjects, will be decided by the majority vote of the Central Legislature and as the Hindu element will be preponderant in the latter, so by sheer weight of numbers the Hindu influence will predominate in all Central State activities. Conflict will arise on a number of

questions affecting the minorities, but their voice will be suppressed on the plea that communal considerations cannot be given to questions affecting India as a whole. A few instances are mentioned :-

Take Foreign Affairs first. Independence based on an appeal to nationalism has the tendency to transgress its proper limits and encroach upon the rights of neighbours. No modern State can be free from this charge if it is strong enough to risk interference in the affairs of others. England and France, have so far been the best examples of Democratic States. But their progress and prosperity were directly the result of their expansion beyond their own territorial limits and of their exploitation of colonies and dependencies. In their foreign affairs, these States have always been guided by their own narrow Imperial interests. England's conquest of India, and Africa may be indefensible from our point of view or even on moral grounds, but the Englishman will always find arguments to defend British Imperialism. Weak States are always endangered when a strong and powerful State comes into being in the neighbourhood. The rise of England and France was responsible for the destruction of the liberties of a number of States in Asia and Africa. The rise of Russia in the 18th century was followed by its gradual absorption of the Muslim States of Central Asia and the states on its Western border. In league with Germany and Austria, Russia was responsible for the dismemberment of the historic kingdom of Poland.

In face of these plain historical facts there can

be no doubt that the rise of India as an aggressive national State will bring it into conflict with its weak neighbours. An admirer of congress ideology, a Hindu Professor of Lahore, once asserted in some political articles contributed by him to the "C. and M.G." and the "Tribune", Lahore, that the real boundaries of Hindustan lay beyond modern Afghanistan which was a part of India and that if this country had been conquered by the British, it would have secured the Indian frontier once for all from the danger of immediate invasion. Who can doubt if Congress were to assume full political power in an independent India or the future, how many more such professors will use their pen to justify India's expansion beyond her present frontiers?

Besides expansion, two other important questions which follow from the establishment of a modern national State are, colonisation and possession of foreign markets. The British, the French, and almost all other European nations tried to solve these questions by conquering other countries outside Europe and by exploring their resources. The partition of Africa was aimed at both the double object of furnishing new homelands and markets for trade to the mother country. England, France, Belgium and Portugal all got unequal shares in the booty. Germany and Italy arrived late on the scene and had to make do with what was grudgingly spared by others. In her own territory, vast in respect of its size and population, she cannot be an exception to colonial policy.

tendencies. Russia possessed immense resources in European territories, which are sufficient to feed double its present population, and yet this could not prevent the Russians from expanding eastwards and taking possession of Siberia and Turkistan.

India's population is rapidly increasing ; in some provinces it has reached the stage of congestion. Inter-migration from one province to another is already proving a source of trouble. Bengal is a congested area and the people want to migrate to parts of Assam which are still sparsely populated. The first act that the Congress ministry did in Assam on its assumption of power was to impose restrictions upon Muslim settlers from Bengal and from Sylhet and Goalpara Districts of Assam in order to stop their migration into the interior.

The Muslim areas in the North-West are at present sparsely populated. There is further scope for the development of cultivation in Kashmir, parts of the Punjab and Sind, but the Hindu areas immediately adjoining are not in a position to provide enough food for their present population. The U.P., with an area smaller than that of the Punjab, has double its population, while Rajputana can never be developed to provide for its surplus population in view of the barrenness of its soil and the scarcity of water. Both these areas are a danger to the solidarity of the Muslim population in the Punjab and Sind. Even now large numbers of people are found in almost every town of the Punjab who have migrated from U.P. and adopted shoe-making,

menial service or factory work as their profession. Recently, there has been a tendency among Hindu factory owners, to recruit labour from the U.P. and thereby increase the Hindu element among the workers.

In a scheme of united India under Congress hegemony, inter-provincial migration will be a central subject and so the Muslims will have no voice to prevent Hindu immigrants from the U.P. or Rajputana from settling in their midst or acquiring lands in uninhabited parts. This question may not assume importance now when all attention is turned on the question of independence, but it will one day claim priority over all other questions pending for solution between Hindus and Muslims.

How important the question of immigration to a country is, can be judged from the strained relations that arose recently between India and Ceylon, and India and Burma on this point. The Ceylon and Burma Governments wanted to impose restrictions upon all future immigration. The Indian labourer had come into competition with the native of the soil in Burma and Ceylon. It was feared by the Burmese and Ceylonese that if Indian settlers continued to enter their countries unchecked, they would supplant the natives one day and present new and complicated problems for solution.

The Indian labour has in the past flooded the markets in many other countries. The Malay Peninsula, British East Africa, South Africa and many islands of the Indian Ocean have large numbers

of Indian settlers. The Malay Peninsula was originally a Muslim country, with a Muslim preponderance of over 90% in population, but since the free immigration of the Hindu labourer from Southern India and the Chinese settler, the country has been converted into a non-Muslim area where the proportion of Muslims has been reduced to one-third. A similar fate will befall the Muslim islands of Mauritius and Zanzibar if the flow of Indian labour is not checked in time.

India has in its neighbourhood vast areas inhabited by Muslims. In the north-west, lies the belt of Muslim States comprising Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. North of India beyond Kashmir lies Chinese Turkistan, which is purely a Muslim country. In the south-east, lie the Malay Peninsula and the islands of Malay Archipelago. Sumatra and Borneo, are two large islands with a combined area three times bigger than the Punjab and a total population of less than one-third of the Punjab. These islands may furnish a good homeland to the Indian settler,

Away to the west of India, beyond the Indian Ocean lies Africa. Here originally the Arab dominated trade and commerce, but now, besides the European, the Indian has come to compete with him and has practically ousted him from the benefits of trade. Indian colonies have been set up all along the coast and it is quite possible to believe that these colonial settlements will provide grounds for conflict with the interests of the natives

in these parts, once India is strong enough to pursue a policy of colonisation abroad. Now all these questions, whether concerning foreign relations with Muslim countries or concerning emigration of Indians to the Muslim islands of East Indies or Muslim parts of Africa, will bring into conflict the interests of Hindus and Muslims in the Central Legislature, but as the latter will be in a minority, their voice will be legally ineffective and hence be suppressed.

There is another danger to which the Muslims will be exposed if the Foreign Policy is controlled by a Central Government dominated by Hindus. If China and Soviet Russia survive the present war and they continue to exercise their sovereignty over their respective territories, it is possible that a Free India may enter into alliance with these two countries for a very selfish object. All these countries reckon among their inhabitants millions of Muslims who occupy compact areas. In Soviet Russia, Muslims form an overwhelming majority of the population in Turkistan and Azerbaijan while in China Proper, the Muslims form a majority in some western Provinces which can together be united to form a single State. With the awakening of political consciousness among the Turko-Tartars of Central Asia and Chinese Muslims of Western China, it is quite reasonable to expect a demand for self-determination among them.

When such a state of affairs arises, it will be in the interest of the Governments of India, China

and Soviet Russia to offer a united front on the minority question and to use all their resources to suppress Muslim demand for independence in any of the parts of their big empires. In fact, the Indian Government of the future will offer the strongest opposition to the demand of the Muslims of Central Asia for full independence and will never agree to see a strong and powerful Muslim State of 20 millions of people, as it will constitute in its opinion a permanent menace to the future of India.

Undoubtedly, the creation of a new Muslim State comprising Russian and Chinese parts of Turkistan will strengthen the block of Muslim States in the west of India, as together they will command allegiance of 80 millions of Muslims including the three most virile and warlike races of Islam, the Turks, the Afghans and the Arabs. If to this block is added the Muslim State of Pakistan, in the North-west of India with its Muslim population of 30 millions, it will magnify the Hindu fear into a permanent nightmare and probably this may be one of the reasons why the Hindu is opposed to the idea of Pakistan.

But it would be equally suicidal for an Indian Muslim if, for the sake of appeasing the Hindu and creating a united India where Hindus will be in permanent possession of supreme power, he should not merely forego his right of self-determination for 60 millions of Muslims who live in two distinct regions of India, but should also agree, whether

willingly or under coercion, to see the Indian Government of the future united with China and Russia in suppresing the claims of Muslim minorities in their empires for independence.

The Muslim block of the States of Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey will lose all its political importance if it is deprived of the additional strength that it may gain from the creation of the Muslim States of Turkistan, Western China and Pakistan. The very existence of the present Muslim States will be threatened if the three Imperial Governments of the future, India, China and Russia, unite in the pursuit of a common policy towards their Muslim subjects and the neighbouring Muslim States. Circumstances may even arise which may force India and Russia to dismember these Muslim States and divide them between themselves. In such a state of affairs, India may claim Afghanistan, while Turkey, Iraq and Iran may be considered Russian spheres of influence.

It may be considered utopian on my part to lay emphasis upon fears which do not exist at present. The Congress nationalists may try to dispel such fears by their high political morals which they claim to have introduced in India's public life. Mahatma Gandhi's example may be quoted as that of a patriotic Indian who has no political ambitions beyond the attainment of independence, and who will never resort to force to secure decisions in his favour.

I do not believe that there is any other Hindu

who has done more to undermine Muslim solidarity in India or to advance Hindu interests than Mahatma Gandhi. But granted for the sake of argument, that Congress nationalism under his leadership is the most ideal in form, what guarantee is there that it will continue to remain so in future?

The national movement in every country at the start bases its appeal upon the justice of its cause and finds among its leaders a host of selfless workers. Modern Italy, when in the making in the 19th century, appeared to be the most harmless State which aimed at nothing but the unification of the Italian peoples. Its first real founder, Mazzini was like Mahatma Gandhi an idealist, who built the claims of Italian nationalism on high moral grounds. He stirred the whole world by the graphic picture that he drew in his speeches and writings of the ills of his country. England and France openly supported the movement for unity and independence in Italy. But to our bitter experience, this very country, which was expected to exert a healthy influence in the struggle for rivalry among the European States, assumed the role of an aggressor towards its weak neighbours. None but a blind follower of the cult of nationalism can justify Italy's invasious of Albania and Abyssinia.

The Congress nationalists cannot claim higher virtues than the first leaders of Modern Italy. The modern Italian leaders are seeking expansion and colonisation at the expense of others; they seek excuses in the growth of Italy's population

and the smallness of its cultivable lands. They pretend to be guided by the best interests of the Italian people in their dealings with others. Will not the Congress nationalists of the future adopt a similar policy?

I said at the start that the Congress Rightists aim at the establishment of the Capitalist democracy of the Western type in India. They look to Great Britain and its dominions for a model. The British democracy is in their opinion ideal in form. Private enterprise or individualism in trade has been the main characteristic of British public life. Wealth has concentrated into the hands of the upper classes, while the lower classes earn their living as wage-earners in factories.

The Congress wants to follow the British to industrialise the country. Big Hindu financiers and millowners are patronised by it. Recently B. Rajendra Prashad presided at the opening ceremony of a ship building yard, constructed by a Hindu millionaire. This shows the Congress trend. Industry will be encouraged, not as a state activity, but as a private enterprise. The Congress Government will chalk out plans for the industrialisation of various parts of the country, but all capital will be provided by private enterprise and initiative and control will be left in private hands.

The natural effect of this policy will be that all industries will pass into non-Muslim hands who possess wealth and the means to utilise it. Muslim

who are already economically in a backward condition, will sink still lower in comparison with Hindus under a scheme of private enterprise in industry. They will in fact merge into the lowest order of society to be exploited permanently by their Hindu masters.

Thus independence as visualised by the Congress Rightists will not change for the better the fate of the minorities and the masses in general. The Hindu intellectuals, comprising doctors, lawyers, traders, bankers and money-lenders, will be returned to power and these will combine to exploit other classes. Through their wealth, influence, and propaganda, they will be able to win support from minorities for legislative measures designed to ameliorate the lot of their own order. Economic equality of the masses will be out of the question where wealth is allowed to concentrate in the hands of one class of people, and where the right to exercise the vote is exploited by the upper classes. Social equality is unthinkable in a society based on caste system and still exercising restraint in its intercourse with others. Such an independence, which implies a mere change of masters and at the same time strengthens the position of the very community which by its past attitude has encouraged economic and social inequality, will never appeal to a Muslim who believes in the equality of man not only in the right to vote but also in the right to meet as equal and to share as equal in the economic resources of the country.

At present the Muslims in towns have been ousted from their due share in trade by the superior organisation of the Hindus while the Muslim cultivator is heavily indebted to the Hindu moneylender. A repudiation of all debts, encouragement of trade by Muslims in predominant Muslim areas, distribution of cultivable lands according to the requirements of farmers, prohibition of interest as a source of profit and encouragement of industries under State control—such items can form a possible programme to win over the Muslim masses.

But the Congress Rightists do not believe in social and economic equality between a Hindu and a Harijan or a Hindu and a Muslim. They are fighting for a political issue. Their immediate object is independence, as in this way alone they can exercise their influence on the individual's right to vote.

Social inequality does not bother them much, as the depressed classes cannot afford to break with Hindus. Moreover in this case there is only a question of readjustment of social relations between members of the same society.

Economic inequality also does not stir them. The Hindus still possess wealth and influence in India out of proportion to their population strength. If they raise this issue now, it will only be the Muslims who will gain. Hence they are evading this question. They want to wrest political power at the Centre to preserve what they call India.

integrity, unity and indivisibility. But if this political power is to be shared by the Congress with the Muslim League on terms of equality as representatives of two separate nations, they will rather give up their demand for complete independence than agree to the separation of one fourth of India under the scheme of Pakistan.

The real reason why Hindus are so much opposed to Pakistan is that it strikes at the root of their vested interests, and shatters to pieces all their dreams of exploiting the entire sub-continent of India. Their emphasis on India's unity, indivisibility is a political stunt to stifle the national consciousness of Muslims for their full share in the political and economic field.

The rejection of Cripps' proposals by the Congress gives a clear indication of the Hindu mentality. The proposals gave a vague hope to the Muslims that their majority provinces might claim separation from the Indian Union if a plebiscite resulted in their favour. This was enough to exasperate Mr. Gandhi who could not bear that even a faint hope of separation should be held out to Muslims. His subsequent activities culminating in the threat of mass civil disobedience were solely directed to coerce the British Government to undo the harm it had done by the insertion of the separation clause in Cripps' proposals. The 'Quit India' campaign was primarily meant to wrest all power at the centre so that the Muslims may not be in a position later on to force the issue of separation. There are

strong reasons to believe that the Congress would have given the Cripps' proposals a fair trial, but for the separation clause. If the Congress had been sincere in its attitude towards Muslims and wanted to share political power with Muslim League on an agreed basis, nothing could have prevented it from coming to terms with the League and presenting a united front. Its utter disregard of the claim of Muslim League to speak on behalf of Muslims and its insistence on settlement on the basis of one nation theory gave a clear proof that it has no scope for the assertion of political rights by 90 millions of Muslims in a scheme of independence visualised by it

5. *Confederation is Impossible*

There is general consent in all quarters in India on the need of a territorial redistribution of Provinces. The Congress favours the scheme on a linguistic basis, the League on a religious and cultural basis. In practice there is not much difference between the Congress and League schemes of redistribution except in regard to the Punjab and Bengal.

So far as these two Provinces are concerned, Muslims agree that a territorial readjustment is necessary to raise their present proportion of percentage in population, but they want to leave the final decision to the plebiscite of the Muslims living in these Provinces. They are not prepared to accept territorial changes which may affect adversely the economic and strategic position of the Muslim Zones in the north-west and north-east of India and also reduce substantially the present area and population of these Provinces.

One section among Muslims stands for the preservation of the present limits of the Punjab and Bengal as in this way alone the economic interests of these provinces can better be safeguarded. This section in fact supports the principle of territorial nationalism based upon an appeal to the common interests of Muslims and other minorities living in two distinct parts of

India. It foresees a future when two Federations, the one composed of the Punjab and the four contiguous units of Kashmir, N.W.F. Province, Sind and Baluchistan and the other consisting of Bengal and Assam will function as independent States. The other Muslim section and by far the most influential one desires the separation of Ambala Division from the Punjab, and some districts from Western Bengal to make the remaining parts more compact and homogeneous. In case of Bengal, it further recommends the inclusion of some districts of Assam which are predominantly Muslim. This is considered to be the only means of giving effective working majorities to Muslims in their Provincial Legislatures and of minimising the chances of communal conflict. The All-India Muslim League more truly represents the opinion of this section and sticks to its Lahore Resolution, popularly known as 'the Pakistan Scheme', laying down "that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial adjustments as may be necessary." According to the League conception, "the areas in which Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones should be grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign." It is here that acute differences have arisen between the Congress and the League. The Hindus may be willing to accept a regrouping of territories for considerations of administrative experience, economic advantage, racial, linguistic

or geographical homogeneity or community of customs and habits as has been pointed out by a Hindu Unionist Minister of the Punjab but their political conceptions do not reconcile them to the idea of complete separation and independence on this basis. The principle of self-determination which is claimed to be the birthright of the people of India is denied when the same is demanded by Muslims in their majority Provinces.

Between the two extremes of complete separation for predominant Muslim zones and their subordination under a scheme of Federation, no compromise is possible. Some, however, suggest a Confederation of Autonomous zones or Provinces, voluntarily agreed upon by the participating units on a basis of equality of status. Let us analyse this compromise plan. A federal government at the centre responsible to an elected legislature has been unequivocally rejected by the Muslim League and even the saner elements among non-party Hindus have begun to see the force of Muslim view-point.

Federation always presupposes on the part of federating units a desire for union and not unity and where some units lack the will to unite nothing but coercion can secure their attachment even for the time being. A superimposed federal constitution will never meet with success and will sooner or later come into serious conflict with its constituent parts. Hence the only alternative to avoid the disastrous effects of a scheme of enforced

federation is complete independence of the discontented unit. There is no other scheme which may dispel the latter's genuine fears and gain its willing consent even for coordination in certain activities of common interest when its interests are fundamentally at variance with the Federating Centre.

Political experience has so far presented no solution for a problem of the magnitude which India is facing. In U. S. A. and Switzerland, the only real examples of Federation, the experiment was tried among homogeneous peoples allied by religion, culture and history, and even in their case, the process could not be completed without facing insuperable difficulties. There were civil wars in both countries. In U. S. A., the Southern States would not have agreed to Union, had they not been conquered by the North while in Switzerland, the seven Catholic cantons persisted in their independence till they were defeated and forcibly united. Such a possibility of civil war may arise in India if the issue of separation versus Federation remains undecided, but the results will be disastrous for both sides and will lead to permanent enslavement of the people. The majority community cannot claim from the examples of U. S. A. and Switzerland that it has a right to coerce minorities. Firstly because their analogy does not apply to India in view of the complexity of its problems: In U. S. A., the Federalists differed from the Southern people simply on the question of slavery which was the main cause of the Civil War

and were united otherwise by a common outlook on life. They had no religious, cultural, linguistic or historical differences which could divide them permanently. Secondly, the majority cannot be sure of victory against the minority in a physical conflict. The Muslim minority is still strong enough to defend itself provided there is no split in its ranks and help may also be available to it from unexpected quarters. This again leads to the only course open to the majority that it should recognise the claims of the minority for self-determination.

Confederation as an alternative plan has been tried in the past to unite two or more states with common interest. The Mahratta Confederacy in India and the German Confederation prior to 1871, were examples of this. In a Confederation, the right of the confederates to maintain separate armies and to have supreme control over their own internal affairs is always recognised. A Confederation presupposes independent units first and then in their own interest they are forced to unite with others, equal in status with them.

A nearer approach to a true Confederation was made in the Dual Monarchy in 1867. Austria and Hungary both were united under the House of Hapsburg for defence and foreign affairs and finance. The ministers were responsible to two separate committees, one for Austria and the other for Hungary, each composed of 60 members, elected annually by their respective legislatures. There were besides economic committees representing the

two countries, in equal strength which regulated their commercial relations, customs and tariffs.

The real motive force which underlay this dual system was a league between the two strongest races, the Germans and Magyars who divided the Monarchy between them and by the grant of Provincial Autonomy to the two next strongest races, the Poles and the Croats made them their accomplices in holding down the remaining eight. It was probably in the light of this old system that the Croats and Serbs of Yugoslavia recently entered into a compromise and divided the country between themselves on the basis of two separate nations united at will for defence and other common interests.

Proposals more or less of a similar nature have been made in India by Sir Sikander Hayat Khan, the Punjab Premier and Mr. C. R. Reddy, the Vice-Chancellor of Andhra University. The Punjab Premier in reply to a question in the Assembly to clarify his position in regard to Pakistan scheme admitted that he was responsible for the original draft of the Lahore resolution popularly termed as the Pakistan resolution but he did not agree with the amended form which demanded complete separation for Muslim Zones. He suggested a Zonal scheme which should reflect Hindu and Muslim majorities in their respective regions. In each Zone the majority was to govern with the help of the minority. The Centre in his opinion should be a Co-ordination Committee acting as the

agent of the various units which should have the right to secession if their interests were not properly safeguarded by it. Customs, railways, defence, currency and foreign affairs were to be the special spheres to which the activities of the Centre should be confined, but the various units were to have powers to supervise and control these activities. The object of his scheme is to protect the units against encroachments from a domineering Centre and thereby add to the solidarity and strength of India as a whole.

This scheme does not meet the Muslim viewpoint and is ambiguous as to the proper role of the Centre. If the Centre is merely to exercise the agency functions of the autonomous units, it should better be left to the discretion of the latter what matters of common interest they want to assign to it. Such a Centre cannot be entrusted with important problems like defence, foreign affairs and railways. It is just like asking Germany and Italy to have a coordination Committee for the protection of their common interests. The very fact that the Centre should not domineer over the units but be subject to their control obviates the necessity of having any Centre at all.

Mr. C. R. Reddy's scheme advocated a Central Government formed on the principle of a Confederation as an alternative to Pakistan Scheme. His diagnosis of the real situation "that Muslims require a strong enough representation in the Central Government and sufficient power for safe-

guarding their cultural interests without depending on the grace of others or constitutional arrangements" is undoubtedly true but the remedy he suggests cannot restore Muslim confidence. He recommends a Central Cabinet of 11 or 12 members, each member being a nominee of a Provincial Government and he fixes the Muslim strength in proportion to the number of their Provinces. Thus according to his scheme, there will be 5 Muslims, 6 Hindus and one Sikh Minister and the premiership will be held by rotation by the three important communities. The scheme fails to recognise that Confederation has no stronger claims for acceptance than Federation where the will to unite is lacking.

Muslims will not accept any constitution which is imposed upon them against their will. The advantages of a strong or weak Centre do not appeal to them. The areas in which they form a numerical majority are well marked regions and have nothing to gain by their Confederation with the Hindu Centre. The problem of defence is the only important question that matters them but here too the people of these regions are strong enough to defend their frontiers. In case of Pakistan with its resources in men and material twice as great as those of Afghanistan, the problem of defence does not present an insuperable difficulty. In fact with a mutual pact of non-aggression with Afghanistan small armies will be required to defend the frontier on either side between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Income from customs, income-tax, salt, railways, currency and mint

which at present form sources of the Central Revenue will be quite sufficient to meet the defence expenditure of Pakistan.

—:—

6 *Pakistan Is The Only Solution.*

Modern Nationalism has both been a unifying and disruptive force in the world. In some countries, it has helped to preserve or even expand their existing frontiers on the principle of one nation in one state while in others it has led to a desire for separation on the part of important minority peoples who could be converted into majorities by a readjustment of geographical frontiers. As a unifying force, nationalism was responsible for the creation of a united Germany and an awakened Italy in Europe in the 19th century. As a disruptive force, it encouraged the dismemberment of the former Austro-Hungarian, Turkish and Russian Empires into a number of new and independent states. The British Empire in India belongs to the second group of countries where nationalism has failed to unite the two major communities and is hastening the process of disintegration. The Hindus and the Muslims are in full agreement in their desire for the liberation of the sub-continent of India from the foreign yoke but they are inspired with directly opposite motives for this end.

The Hindus aim at the establishment of a strong government at the centre which shall be responsible to a legislature representing their pre-

ponderance in population. They support a parliamentary form of government after the British model as this is the only way in which they can effectively control the predominant Muslim parts of India on the basis of a party system of government which in the West presupposes the existence of a homogeneous nation. They consider their community entitled to frame or amend the future constitution without the approval of Muslims who as a minority have no special rights to preserve except those concerning religion, language or culture. The Indian Muslims who form one-fourth of the total population and number 90 millions are in their opinion comparable to minorities in European countries or even to Jews who are scattered all over the world.

The strongest political organisation of the Hindus is the Indian National Congress which as its very name indicates claims to represent the interests of India as a whole but which in practice is the mouthpiece of an aggressive form of Hindu nationalism which cloaks its real intentions, behind ambiguous terms and slogans. The Congress insists on unity, democracy and nationality as its guiding principles, but the Muslim League objects to these on the grounds that India's present political unity is a British creation and never existed in the past, that democracy is foreign to the conception of Hindu society which is based on caste system and nationality does not exist in practice as the essential links in the form of religion, race, language, culture and history are lacking in India,

Mahatma Gandhi is the virtual dictator of the Congress and commands blind obedience of millions of Hindus though he is not even its four anna member. The ordinary Hindu not merely looks upon him as a great political leader, but a divine, an incarnation of God, who has assumed the human form as Rama and Krishna did in the past to regenerate Hindu society, to revive its ancient culture and civilization and to restore it to its past greatness. Mr. Gandhi's political programme includes the consolidation of Hindu society by winning over the depressed classes and exploiting their voting strength. His social programme comprises the encouragement of Hindi language and script, the promotion of Wardha scheme of education, and the propagation of Gandhian philosophy and principles of Hindu life such as non-violence, use of hand-spun cloth and hunger-strike. All these activities from the Muslim point of view are intended to destroy their national consciousness and pride. In proportion as the Congress has gathered its strength among the Hindus, to the same extent it has lost its influence on Muslims who have rallied to the Muslim League as the standard-bearer of their political rights in India.

The League stands for the principle of self-determination to decide the future of 90 millions of Indian Muslims. It does not accept the Cameron theory of one nation in one state which ignores the realities of the situation. Two-thirds of Muslim population in India is concentrated in well-defined

and compact areas on the frontiers. The north western region watered by the Indus and its tributaries and comprising the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind, Kashmir and Baluchistan is a distinct part of India with its own railway and drainage systems, natural frontiers. The Muslims here number 75 percent in a total population of 40 millions, and are physically the strongest element in India's population. They have distinct historic and military traditions of their own and have always held a position of pride and power under the Muslim Kings of the past. Even now they account for more than half the present strength of the Indian army. If there is any part of India which can defend its independence against foreign aggression, it is this region which for the sake of convenience is called Pakistan in popular language. The word Pakistan in Urdu is derived from the initial letters of the Punjab, Afghan Province (N.W.F.P.), Kashmir, and Sind and the last three letters 'tan' from Baluchistan. In the broader sense the word is applied to denote a scheme of partition which will lead to the formation of independent Muslim states in India on the principle of self-determination.

The economic interests of the North-western region also demand its political separation. It is essentially the home of an agricultural population which depends for its prosperity upon the sale of its surplus land produce. Unless there is a scheme of industrialisation which may take years to come

into force, a policy of Free Trade to find ready markets for raw materials in exchange for textile and machinery will be the most desirable in the interest of the vast majority of its people. But in a scheme of united India, there is every danger that the Hindu industrialists and mill-owners of Bombay and elsewhere will exert through the Central Government to enforce a policy of protection to shut out foreign goods from entering into competition with the products of their factories. This will leave the rural population at the mercy of Hindu India and deprive it of the right to exchange its products direct with Europe on the basis of Free Trade. It will have to accept reduced prices for its land products as foreign markets will be closed to them and will be forced to sell them at a loss in Indian markets where similar raw materials will be available in sufficient quantities. Thus economically Pakistan will be a loser if it is placed under the authority of a Central Government and her fate will be worse than that of Southern and Western Australia and Tasmania which have gained nothing by their participation in the Commonwealth of Australia.

Apart from the predominant Muslim region in the North West of India popularly called Pakistan there is another distinct Muslim area in the North East, comprising parts of Assam, the whole of Eastern Bengal and some districts of Western Bengal. This region will correspond more or less to what was formerly called the Governor

Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam. The establishment of an independent Muslim State in this region will result in the concentration of 30 millions of Muslims as a majority of 70p.c. in population. Eastern Bengal is already divided into three administrative divisions and preserves its identity as the homeland of Muslim Bengalese. Assam joins common frontiers with it on the eastern side and is mostly inhabited by the Hindu and Muslim Bengalese in equal proportion. The original inhabitants of Assam form a minority of less than one third. The separation of Sylhet and Goalpara districts of Assam which are predominantly Muslim will give the native Assamese an effective and real voice in the administration of the remaining area. The Hindu minority in this Muslim State will not exceed 30p.c. in a total population of 40 millions. The question of race and language will not be disturbing factors here as Muslim and Hindu Bengalese are both allied in this respect while the special interests of the Hindu minority will be protected in the constitution.

It will thus be evident that there is no other alternative to reconcile the fundamental differences in the political outlook of the two major communities than to assign them separate homelands in their respective predominant areas. The P a k i s t a n scheme does not involve any large scale transfer of population nor it substantially disturbs the present administrative units of India. The three Muslim Provinces of the Punjab, Sind and N.W.F.P. with

Baluchistan, Kashmir and other native states will be amalgamated to form a Federal Government, the federating parts retaining full local autonomy. Similarly Eastern Bengal will be united with parts of Assam and Western Bengal to form a compact area. The Hindus will be secure in the enjoyment of their political and economic rights in the rest of India which will comprise the present Provinces of Bombay, Madras, United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bihar and Orissa as well as Western Bengal and the native states. Hyderabad alone of all the Indian states, will be entitled to independent political existence in view of its treaty rights as an ally of the British Government.

The question of minorities that will still remain unaffected by the adoption of Pakistan scheme will be determined on a reciprocal basis. In the proposed Muslim states with a total population of 80 Millions, non-Muslim minorities will number 20 millions while in Hindu India the Muslims will form 25 millions out of a total population of 260 millions. Safeguards for the protection of religion, language and culture will be provided for these minorities while special representation in services, local bodies and legislature will be secured to them on the existing basis or on a new agreed plan. The present conflict between Congress and League which has strained the relations of the two communities will come to an end, and all political differences will be finally reconciled. The two peoples will settle down to

a life of peace and prosperity, absorbed in the pursuit of their own activities in their respective national states.

The Muslim states from their very strategic position on the two important land frontiers of India will protect Hindu India from all danger of external aggression. The North-west Frontier of India will lose much of its present political importance. The frontier tribes which have been disturbing peace in the settled districts of N.W.F.P. from time to time will be entirely won over by an appeal to their religious sentiment by the new government in Pakistan, predominantly Muslim in character. The tribesmen who have in the past resorted to acts of brigandage and murder, not so much from personal grudge or political motives as from sheer necessity of their self-preservation will be attracted to a life of peaceful cultivation in selected parts to be reserved for their settlement. Afghanistan will be relieved of all fear of aggression from the Forward Policy of the British Government in India and will in her own interest be forced to enter into a permanent treaty of alliance with the Pakistan Government. In fact with Soviet Russia holding a pistol at Afghanistan's head in the north, the latter can never be in a position to constitute any real danger for India. In the new changed conditions, the security of India along with that of the Muslim states of Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey, if ever is threatened by land in future will only be menaced by an invasion from Soviet,

Russia which may emerge stronger from this war and seek expansion southwards.

The British Government has so far failed to appreciate the Muslim point of view. While it admits that the Muslims are entitled to assurances for the development of their culture and institutions in their own way, it still insists on the essential unity of India as the only way in its opinion in which India can enjoy internal peace and external security. It is open to reason how a nation of 90 millions which is concentrated in two compact areas to the extent of two-thirds of its strength, and is, judged by any modern test, entitled to independent existence can be forced to accept a position of subjection for the sake of a united India which will be dominated by a permanent hostile Hindu communal majority. Safeguards can be offered to a minority scattered over a wide area and not mustering strong anywhere to be able to form a separate government. These can be offered to Muslim minorities in the Hindu Provinces or to Hindu and Sikh minorities in Muslim Provinces but it sounds fantastic that a whole community which exceeds in population every great power of today except Soviet Russia and U.S.A., should be left at the mercy of a hostile community whose very social structure, based as it is on caste system, is the negation of democracy. Muslims in India have to deal with conditions unknown in any other part of the world.

In Europe and America national states have been formed by people more or less homogeneous

in their outlook on life. The most important unifying force in a modern state is the consciousness of a common civilisation through religion, language and history. There is hardly any state which does not satisfy this factor. Wherever in the past any conflict of interests has arisen in fundamentals, separation has always been accepted to be the only solution. In Ireland, the British maintained the political unity of the island for centuries under their rule but when the popular demand for independence made its influence felt, the island was divided into two separate states merely on grounds of differences in history and religion. The Protestant Irish though a minority of 20 p.c. did not agree to accept the unity of their common motherland. No safeguards were considered effective enough to dissuade the Protestants from separation. The Roman Catholic Irish were prepared to guarantee them special privileges and rights and simply wanted a union for the purposes of defence but they could not win over the Protestants. A similar experiment was tried by the French in Syria in establishing separate republics for Muslim and Christian Arabs in Syria and Lebanon respectively. Although partition of a small country like Syria was not justifiable on racial or linguistic grounds as the Arabs are allied by race and language yet differences in religion alone were considered a sufficient reason for the change. The same principle was at work in Palestine which has so far been deprived of responsible government on account of religious differences. The Jewish minority does not wish to

live under the rule of Muslim Arabs. Thus if small peoples like the Protestant Irish in Ireland, the Christian Arabs in Syria and the Jews in Palestine do not wish to lose their separate political identity, and are supported in their desire for separate existence by two of the foremost democratic nations, there is no reason why Indian Muslims should be forced to accept the position of a minority.

Here it will not be out of place to acquaint the reader with the testimony of two competent authorities on the complexity of India's problem. The authors of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform open the very first page of their Report (Vol. 1, Part 1) in the following words: -- "India is inhabited by many races often as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe. Two-thirds of its inhabitants profess in one form or another Hinduism as their religion; and the difference between the two is not only one of religion, but also of law and of culture. They may be said indeed to represent two distinct and separate civilisations. Hinduism is distinguished by the phenomenon of caste which is the basis of its religious and social system, and except in a very limited field, remains unaffected by contact with philosophies of the West. The religion of Islam, on the other hand, is based upon the conception of the equality of man."

The picture drawn above was continued earlier in 1930 in the Report of the Indian Statist

Commission Vol. I (year 1930) which thus describes the problem.

"When British authority began to extend over the Indian continent, it could, as a neutral, set up and endeavour to apply a canon of tolerance, but it could not alter the essential facts of Hindu-Muslim difference. It would be an utter misapprehension to suppose that Hindu-Muslim antagonism is analogous to the separation between religious denominations in contemporary Europe. Differences of race, a different system of law, and the absence of inter-marriage, constitute a far more effective barrier. It is a basic opposition manifesting itself at every turn in social custom and economic competition, as well as in mutual religious apathy."

The Muslims fail to understand why the British Government considers the political unity of India essential for its security from external and internal danger. Was it guided by a similar consideration when it chose to separate Burma from India or earlier agreed to maintain the separate political existence of Nepal and Bhutan which strictly speaking lie within the borders of India? Even Ceylon with which Hindus claim their age-long cultural association has been left intact to hold direct relations with the British Imperial Government. Supposing India is divided into Muslim and Hindu sovereign states, what new dangers will threaten the security of the latter if they all agree to become member states of the 'British' Commonwealth of Nations and enter into pacts of non-

aggression with one another? The problem of India's Frontier is entirely a British necessity. There will be no longer the need of stationing a huge army on the frontiers, if the people in Afghanistan and tribal areas realise that a powerful Muslim state has come into power which is prepared to reconcile with them past differences if any. By political and economic concessions, the tribes can be permanently appeased while modern Afghanistan will welcome the opportunity to fraternise with a new Muslim state which will be in full agreement with it in forming a common front against a possible Russian invasion. The danger from the sea can be met by the British navy, the services of which will be required as long as the new Indian states will not be in a position to have their own naval forces.

As for security from internal danger, this will never be jeopardised as the establishment of their respective states will give the two major communities a wide scope for the pursuit of their peaceful activities and the development of their own economic resources. There will be no more occasions of conflict in the political or economic field just as such conflicts have ceased to occur in Ireland after the partition of the country. The minorities in Muslim and Hindu states will be reconciled to their lot and cease to disturb public life as their interests will be specially protected on a reciprocal basis. The main cause of friction between the two communities at present lies in their deep-seated

misgivings and fears, based upon past history that if the British leave the country, one community will attempt to dominate over the other. If these suspicions and doubts are finally cleared by conceding to their genuine political aspirations, a permanent basis for the security of India will be established.

But in case the British Government bows before the Congress threat of progressive civil disobedience and imposes at its dictation political unity through a Federal Government at the centre, it will be sowing the seeds of eternal dissensions and conflicts. Even if the Muslims do not see their way to offer any resistance at present on the Pakistan issue, they will be ready subsequently when the war is over to assert their claims for separation. A federal government imposed from above and lacking the confidence of 90 millions of its citizens cannot continue long in peace and stability. No government however strong it may be, can for ever thwart and withstand the united will of a fourth part of its people especially when they are concentrated on its frontiers in positions of strategical importance. No body can imagine or foresee the consequences of creating a united Indian state where two hostile communities will be permanently ranged against each other and will be driven to opposite camps by conflicting interests. It is quite possible that the Muslims will rise at the first opportunity when the security of the country is threatened from external danger to press their

claims for separation. Those who do not sympathise with the Muslim aspirations now when the Federal Government is not yet in force, cannot be expected to win Muslim confidence after the union has been enforced. The experiment will be disastrous in its effect and at the same time unprecedented in the history of the world. There is no other country where a virile and compact community of 90 millions has ever been deprived of its political rights and reduced to the position of a minority.

The Muslim world is fast awakening and the Indian Muslims are an integral part of it. Pan-Islamism may be impossible of attainment as an ideal to unite the Muslim countries under a common system of government but it is still alive to inspire Muslims everywhere to liberate themselves from the domination of others. Indian Muslims form one fourth of the entire Muslim population of the world and cannot remain isolated for long from forces at work in other Muslim countries for their political emancipation. They are in fact expected in view of their numerical strength and political importance to give a lead to the rest of the Muslim World. The late Sir Syed Amir Ali anticipated the cultural and moral achievements of Indian Muslims when he said in 'The Spirit of Islam', "who shall say that the Muslims of India may not, under the auspices of a great European power, be destined to restore to Western and Central Asia something of what their fore-fathers gave

to Europe in the Middle Ages." Sir Mohammad Iqbal also visualised the future of Indian Muslims in the historical presidential address read by him in the All-India Muslim League Session at Allahbad in 1930, when he defined their political goal in these words, "Self-government within the British Empire or without, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India." It was the divine will that Mr. Jinnah should be chosen to give a concrete form to the ideals and aspirations of two of the most illustrious sons of Islam, and to lead the Muslim nation on the onward march to its destined goal. The movement for Pakistan under his able guidance will not only finally bring about the political emancipation of millions of Muslims in India, China, and Russia where they are at present assigned the role of minorities, but will also restore to Islam its lost heritage of the Middle ages. The issues that face the Indian Muslims are tremendous and on their successful achievement depends the fate of almost half the Muslim population of the world which at present is denied the right to determine its own future.

7. *Political Ideals Before A Muslim*

The Muslim population in the world is varying estimated between 350 and 450 millions. According to commonly accepted estimates, the total population does not exceed 400 millions. Continent-wise the Muslim population is distributed as under (in millions) :

Asia 300; Africa 90; Europe 10; North America $1\frac{1}{8}$; South America $1\frac{1}{8}$; Australia $1\frac{1}{8}$.

In Asia Muslims form an overwhelming majority in Western Asia, Central Asia, East Indies and four provinces each in India and China. In Western Asia, the Muslim population is divided in the 6 countries of Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Arabia, Iran and Afghanistan and numbers 65 millions. In Central Asia which includes Russian and Chinese Turkistan, the Muslim population is estimated at 20 millions. In India and China, Muslims respectively number 100 millions and 50 millions. In East Indies which includes the islands of Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, Moluccas, Timor, etc., the vast majority of the people are Muslims, being 65 millions in number out of a total population of 70 millions. In Africa Muslims form a majority in the northern half of the continent which include the Arab countries of

Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli and Egypt, and the Negro countries of Abyssinia, Nigeria, French Western Africa, Sudan and Somaliland. In Europe, Muslims are found mostly in south-eastern Russia, in Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania. European Turkey, Rumania and Greece.

Racially and linguistically, the Muslim World can be divided into 7 clear sub-divisions. There are the Arabic-speaking people occupying a vast extent of land stretching from the frontiers of Iran on the East to the Atlantic Ocean on the West. This area extends over 6 million square miles of land, with a population of 65 millions of which 60 millions speak the Arabic language. Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, Yemen, and Egypt are independent sovereign states of this region while Oman, Southern Arabia, Syria, Tunis, Morocco and Trans-Jordan are protectorates enjoying internal independence under the protection of Great Britain or France. Tripoli, Algeria, Egyptian Sudan and Palestine are actually governed by foreign powers.

The second sub-division extends from the bounds of China proper in the East up to the Western frontier of Turkey in Europe. This vast region is the homeland of Turko-Tartar races. It is here that Pan-Turanism gained numerous converts on the collapse of old Turkish and Russian Empires. The desire of the Turks in Asia Minor for a reunion with their mother country in Central Asia had received a great impetus under the young Turks but the revival of a new Russia under Soviet regime

has dealt a deathblow to Turkish hopes and ambitions. Except for Turkey which is an independent State, the rest of this region is mostly under Soviet Russia and comprises Turkistan and Trans-Caucasia. Western part of China known as Chinese Turkistan is also a part of Central Asia. The total area of this region is 3 million square miles with a population of 45 millions of whom 40 millions are Muslims, mostly of the Turko-Tartar stock.

The third sub-division is the Iranian Plateau which at present comprises the countries of Iran and Afghanistan. Here Persian language dominates the cultural life of the people. The total area of this region is a million square miles with a population of 30 millions grouped into 15 million Iranians and 15 million Afghans. Baluchistan is strictly speaking a part of this region and has in the past been a province of the Persian Empire.

The Arabs, the Turko-Tartar peoples, the Persians and the Afghans are the most virile races of Islam. Arabic, Turkish and Persian continue to be purely Muslim languages and are under the influence of Islamic culture and traditions. The real world of Islam which is still the mainstay of the political power and strength of Islam is represented by the people speaking these languages.

The fourth and fifth sub-division of Muslim world are India and China which can never come to the position of Muslim countries until or unless the predominant Muslim areas are separated from non-Muslim areas and are transformed into independent

Muslim states. The East Indies and the Negro Belt of land extending right through the heart of Africa from one end of the continent to the other, are undoubtedly Muslim regions, and in course of time can aspire to the status of independent Muslim countries. But their present political condition under the domination of foreign powers does not lend hopes of their gaining independence in the near future. The population of these regions is 65 millions for East Indies and 60 millions for Sudan. The Malays and Negroes respectively inhabit these regions. Java is the most prosperous island of East Indies with a population of 50 millions. In Negro-Sudan, the country of Nigeria which is a British territory is the richest and most fertile part with a population of 20 millions. The Eastern part of Sudan known as Abyssinia and Somaliland is inhabited by a mixed race of Negroes and Arabs called Ethiopians in Abyssinia, Gallas and Somalis in the low lands.

It will be evident from the brief description given above of what is known as the Muslim world that it can be divided into 7 broad divisions which are inhabited by 7 distinct races speaking 7 distinct languages. Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Urdu, Chinese, Malay and Negro dialects are in use in these regions and except in case of Chinese and Urdu, which are spoken by vast numbers of Non-Muslims as well, all the other languages are predominantly Muslim in their influence.

Let us here discuss in brief the political divisions of the Muslim world. There are at

present 7 independent Muslim States. Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Yemén, and Egypt with a total population of 80 millions. Thus only 1/5th of the world Muslim population enjoys perfect independence. The remaining 280 millions are mostly under the subjection of various European nations. Before the present war Great Britain ruled over 100 millions, Holland over 20 millions, France over 35 millions, Soviet Russia over 25 millions, Italy over 10 millions, Spain and Portugal over another 5 millions. In addition to the 230 millions of Muslims under European domination, 50 millions form part of the Chinese Empire. The Muslims in Dutch East Indies have now come under Japanese rule.

If self-determination is applied to the Muslim world, the British Empire will alone give birth to a number of independent Muslim States. The Pakistan states in India, Palestine and Malay Peninsula in Asia, Egyptian Sudan, Somaliland and Nigeria in Africa. Similarly France will have to liberate the Arab States of Morocco, Algeria, Tunis and Syria as well as the Negro territories lying south of the French Sahara. Japan will have to make the most solid contribution to the political power of Islam by restoring to independence 60 millions of Muslims living in Dutch East Indies. Russia will make it possible to bring into existence Turkistan and the Muslim states of Azerbaijan, Daghestan and Circassia in Caucasia. Italy will have to restore independence to Albania and Tripoli. Let us here define in clear terms what are the real demands of the Muslim world which will create

the political aspirations of a Muslim. These are 14 in number and can be described as follows:—

1. Arabia to be formed into a confederation so as to include the States of Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Oman, Kuwait and other principalities of Arabia proper.

2. Syria to form a federated State with perfect independence. Trans-Jordan, Palestine, Syria, proper; Lebanon, Latakia and Jebeli Druse should form the federal parts of the Syrian State.

3. Egyptian Sudan should be joined to Egypt so that the two countries should be permanently placed under a common system of government. This arrangement will add to the power and resources of Egypt and solve for her once for all, the population question.

4. Tripoli, Tunis and Algeria to be declared independent, and united into a single state under the Bay of Tunis.

5. Morocco to be restored to complete independence ; the portion known as Riff in the north and now under Spanish rule as well as the Spanish Rio De Oro in the south be reunited with Morocco.

6. The former Italian empire of Abyssinia which included Abyssinia proper, Eritrea and Somaliland be restored to independence and the territories known as British and French Somalilands be united with it.

7. Independence of Central Asia by a union of Russian and Chinese Turkistan.

8. Afghanistan to be given access to sea and the tirbal territory, be placed under it.

9. The northern countries of Kashmir, Punjab, Sind and Frontier Province to be united to form a separate federation.

10. Eastern Bengal and Assam to be declared a separate part of India with full sovereign rights as an independent state.

11. The 4 Western Provinces of China where Muslims form a majority should be allowed to have a separate federation independent of the Chinese Empire.

12. The islands of East Indies now under Japan, the Malaya Peninsula, and the portion of British Borneo to form an independent Federation of island states.

13. Albania, Azerbaijan, Daghestan and Cuccassian territory to be declared independent States.

14. The French and British territories in western Africa, south of the Great African Desert be formed into a federation of States with Northern Nigeria, Southern Nigeria, French Sudan, Upper Volta, Togoland, Sierra Leone, French Guinea, Ivory Coast, Senegal, Niger, Mauritania, Liberia and the United States as federating part.

If the above 14 demands of the Muslim world are realised, Muslims will have 20 independent states in the world, of which 5 at least will be entitled in due course to the status of first class powers. Below are given the Muslim countries with the respective area and population of each.

Asia.

	Area in Sq. miles	Population in millions
1. Turkey	294,000	20
2. Syria	85,000	5
3. Iraq	116,100	3½
4. Arabia	1,050,000	10
5. Iran	628,000	15
6. Afghanistan with Tribal areas	300,000	15
7. Turkistan	2,200,000	20
8. Pakistan	381,000	35
9. East Bengal and Assam	70,000	40
10. Western China	345,000	40
11. Malay Island Empire	1,100,000	70
Europe,		
12. Albania	10,000	1
13. Azerbaijan	33,000	3
14. Daghestan	20,000	2
15. Circassia	10,000	1

Area in Population in millions
Sq. miles Africa.

16.	Egypt & Sudan	1,250,000	25
17.	Algeria with Tunis and Tripoli	1,400,000	10
18.	Morocco with African Sahara	2,225,000	10
19.	Abyssinia with Somaliland	700,000	10
20.	Western Africa	2,000,000	50
		14,067,000	385

From the population figures supplied above, it evidently follows that Malay Islands will form the most powerful Muslim State, with immense resources in man power and natural fertility of the soil. The people are all Malays by race, Muslims by religion and speak the same language with mild dialectic variations. With an area extending over 11 lac square miles, 9/10th of which is rich in soil and with a population of 70 millions, these islands are destined to play a very important part in the world of Islam, once they attain their independence. Next to the Malay Land, the most powerful Muslim State will be Western Africa with a population of 50 millions, Western China with 40

millions, Bengal and Assam with 40 millions, and Pakistan with 35 millions. Thus if the World of Islam is liberated, it will have five countries likely to become first class powers, four in Asia and one in Africa. In addition, there will be five more second class states, each with population exceeding 15 millions which are in course of time bound to become first class powers due to the rise in population or the general advancement in material prospects. These are Turkey, Egypt, Persia, Turkistan. and Afghanistan. These countries are at present sparsely populated but in 50 years hence their population will have more than doubled and they will come to exert a very great influence in the world problems provided all of them continue to enjoy complete independence which at present is denied to Turkistan and the Egyptian Sudan.

At present there are three great dangers which threaten the movement for independence in the Muslim World. The first danger is in the form of the Minority Problem in India, China and Russia. The Muslims in these three countries number respectively 90, 50 and 25 millions and yet they are assigned the status of minorities and denied the right of self determination to grow up into independent Muslim national states. In Russia the movement for Pan-Turanism which aimed at the unification of all Turko-Tartar races and worked for the ideal of a strong Muslim Empire in Central Asia including the five Soviet Republics of Turkistan and Chinese Turkistan received a severe set-back on the rise of Bolshevich influence. But

there are signs that the Muslims of Central Asia will not rest content with their present subject condition under the domination of Russian and Chinese Empires and will be the first to rise to arms when there is a favourable opportunity. In India, the movement for separation is gaining fresh strength every day and the Muslim intelligentsia is fully conscious of its national importance. The goal before a Muslim is complete independence for those parts of India where he is capable of forming independent Muslim States on the principle of self-determination. The Pakistan movement presents a new ideal in this direction. In China the Muslims are at present allied with the National Government in its struggle against Japan, but if the war terminates successfully in favour of China, the Muslims are sure to gain a voice for the consolidation of their political power in the Western Provinces of China where they are a majority in population. In the Provinces of Kansu, Ninghsia, Chanshin, the Muslims form between 50 and 80 per cent of the population while in Shansi, Shensi, Hupich and Yunan, they exceed 90 per cent. With a slight territorial readjustment, Muslim population can be consolidated in Western China and a Muslim State can be created with population as large as 10 millions.

The second danger which threatens the Muslim World is the foreign nationalities. The Problem Germany and Italy do as others do, they fight for their surplus population which has become three million a year. Both of them are not

Arabs' lands bordering the Mediterranean Sea. Italy tried to convert the Muslim countries of Tripoli, Albania and Smaliland into Italian colonies and has been casting longing looks on Tunis, Syria and Egypt. Germany wants as her share of the loot, the French possessions in Africa including Morocco and Algeria to accommodate her surplus population. This problem, however, does not face Great Britain and France so far as the Muslim countries are concerned, Great Britain has vast colonies in her self-governing Dominions of Canada, S. Africa, Australia and New Zealand which are more than sufficient to provide living space for her additional population, France, on the other hand, is not facing population problem at present. France's present population of 42 millions is much below her own requirements when it is realised that France is as big as Germany and yet is inhabited by a population half that of Germany. Thus the threat to Muslim countries lies in the colonial policy of Germany and Italy, both of whom covet the Muslim lands of N. Africa and wish to convert them into their own colonies where the Muslim population will be slowly extirpated as has been the fate of Tripoli. From a population of a million and a quarter of Arabs in 1911, the Italian colony of Libya, the new name given to Tripoli, has now an Arab population of $5/4$ million. Half a million Arabs have perished during the last 25 years. Japan too has her own colonial ambitions and may in future divert her surplus population to the Muslim islands of Borneo and Sumatra which are sparsely populated at present.

A third danger to the Muslim World lies in the new forces of aggression which have for several years in the past been released in the world by Japan, Italy, Germany and Russia in succession. These countries, particularly the first three were not satisfied with the post-war settlement of Europe and other parts of the world in 1919 and desire a redistribution to suit their interests. If it had been simply their aim to seek markets abroad for the expansion of their trade, that would not have been such a menace to Muslims but the danger lies in the fact that they openly deny that the natives whom they want to govern have any right at all to deserve independence. It is common knowledge that Great Britain built up her empire with imperial interests in view but gradually as a result of awakening among the subject peoples which is primarily due to the democratic traditions of the British people, Great Britain is fast adapting her policy to satisfy the subject peoples. Both Great Britain and France are democracies. They believe in parliamentary institutions and the right of the people to govern. Though the subject peoples are not yet in the enjoyment of those rights which the people in Great Britain and France possess, yet the mere fact that these countries have faith in democratic institutions has a tremendous influence upon their dealings with the subject peoples. It is mainly due to this influence that Great Britain has already granted Dominion Status to her British parts of the Empire, that she has agreed to the freedom of Egypt and Iraq and is resolved to deve-

lop self-governing institutions in India and the rest of her empire. Can we conceive that Germany and Italy will ever show a genuine interest in the good of their subject peoples? How can we expect fair treatment from these countries when the people in their own homelands have been deprived of a democratic form of government and its attendant benefits?



PART II

PROBLEMS OF PAKISTAN

1. Pakistun and the Sikhs.

The Pakistan Scheme has raised a storm of opposition from certain quarters which do not see eye to eye with Muslims. The Sikhs in particular have expressed their strong opposition through a number of meetings. Master Tara Singh, the leader of the extremist section among the Sikhs, has declared that the Pakistan scheme has dealt a blow to the cause of Swaraj and that the Sikhs will repudiate it. Sir Jogendra Singh, a moderate Sikh leader, admits that "obstacles in the way of union are many. There is a pervading air of distrust which is growing as the days pass." He agrees with the Muslims that "theories of pure democracy are inapplicable to India or as a matter of fact to any country." He suggests that "the remedy is not separation, but balanced representation of all interests. It is in securing balanced representation of the classes as the masses that Mr. Jinnah will find the best means of securing the position of his co-religionists."

The basic idea of opposition to the Pakistan Scheme is supplied by the notion, held so far, that India with its present bounds and limits is a

permanent geographical unit and not a mere collection of countries, as is believed by Muslims. One may justly invite the attention of the reader to the condition of India immediately prior to the British rule. The Punjab, with some parts of the Frontier Province and Kashmir, was an independent kingdom under the Sikhs; Sind and Baluchistan were governed by their own chiefs, while the rest of India was split up into a number of independent States of which the most important were the Mahratta confederacy, Mysore, Hyderabad, Oudh and Bengal. Whatever unity India achieved in the past under Muslim rule was the result of external circumstances which brought the greater part of India under a central administration. Even prior to the Muslim invasion of India, the country had lacked unity.

When Mahmud of Ghazni invaded India in the tenth century, he met with no united opposition from a Central Hindu Empire. The Indian continent was then divided into a number of independent kingdoms often at war with one another, and mostly governed by Rajput chiefs. This period in Indian History which roughly extends over 600 years, is called the Rajput Period. Strictly speaking, during the long Hindu Period which extended over 2,000 years or more, India never existed as a single political unit with the present-day bounds and limits. As is truly described by the author of Robert's Historical Geography, "no lasting imperial dominion in India was ever established by a Hindu people, though on three occasions such an event

appeared to come within the bounds of possibility.' The short-lived empire of Asoka which was strictly speaking a Buddhist enterprise, did not include many parts of present-day India while Samundra Gupta's empire about 400 A. D. and Harsha's empire 200 years later did not extend beyond the river Jumna and the Vindhyachal Mountains, nor did they found any lasting dynasty.

The past clearly indicates that it was the Muslims who first gave the idea of unity to the people in the vast sub-continent of India, and this not with a view to see the Muslim population absorbed among the Hindus, but simply because it suited the expansion policy of the Muslim kings. Hindus and Muslims never joined together as members of one coherent nation, but only as members of two different religions and cultures who were placed by destiny under a common system of government. The Muslim kings undoubtedly pursued a liberal policy of toleration towards their Hindu subjects, recognised their freedom of religion and worship, and extended their favours alike to Hindus and Muslims. Under Akbar the Great, an attempt was made for the first time to unite Hindus and Muslims by an appeal to a new common religion, but the attempt met with opposition from all quarters and proved a failure. Thereafter the Hindus and Muslims never had any opportunity to work together under a common system of government which they could claim as the result of their own efforts. On the other hand, the rise of

the Sikhs, Rajputs and Mahrattas on the collapse of the Mughal Empire and their frequent inroads into Muslim States of Hyderabad, Oudh, and Bengal, widened the gulf that already separated the Hindu from the Muslim and gave clear proofs that the new Hindu movements were inspired by a feeling of hatred towards Muslim religion and people and aimed at their complete domination and suppression. History still reminds us of the oppressive and tyrannical rule to which the Muslims were subjected under the Sikhs in the Punjab and the Mahrattas in Central and Southern India.

If the British had not come into the field, there would have been a decisive trial of strength between the Muslims and Hindus, and the one-nation theory of Mr. Gandhi would have been shattered once for all. The combined might of Mysore, Hyderabad, Bengal and Oudh, backed up by the active support of Muslim countries beyond India, was still quite strong enough to cope with the new dangers that threatened Muslim solidarity in India.

Even in their decadent condition, the Muslims yet ruled over more than $\frac{2}{3}$ population of India. The modern provinces of the U. P. Bengal, Bihar; Orissa, Assam, Sind, the greater part of Madras Presidency, which was then ruled by the Nawab of Carnatic or Hyder Ali of Mysore, and Mysore itself were all wrested by the British from the Muslims. The Mahrattas and Sikhs together governed less than $\frac{1}{3}$ of India and their sway

extended over the Punjab, Bombay Presidency and the Central Provinces.

The Sikh kingdom in the Punjab was bound to collapse in the long run, as the Sikhs were torn away by mutual jealousies and quarrels of the various tribes and were exposed to attacks on their western bounds by strong and hardy Muslim warriors. The Sikhs were a mere minority in their own kingdom and had secured domination over a people who were physically and intellectually of the same brand as themselves. The Muslim Jats and Rajputs of the Punjab outnumbered the Sikhs by 5 to 1 and would have risen in arms if the Sikh kingdom had been invaded by Muslim armies and there had arisen internal differences among the Sikh chiefs.

This, however, could not be said in regard to Muslim rule in Bengal, Mysore and Sind. The Muslims were a majority of population in Bengal, and found to their advantage a subject people who were poor in physical strength and intellect. In Mysore, Hyder Ali had established a strong kingdom. The subject people were mostly Hindus, but they had been so demoralised by centuries of peaceful rule in the past that they had lost touch with the art of fighting.

The Mahratta danger had lost its moral force. The crushing defeat in the third battle of Panipat in 1761 had dealt a death blow to the power of the Peshwas and hence-forth, Holkars, Scindias and

Bhonsla had become the rivals for the distribution of the Mahratta Empire. The mutual jealousies and quarrels of the Mahratta chiefs would have once again turned to the advantage of the Muslims and another appeal to the Muslim kingdoms to unite against a common danger would have once again proved a decisive factor in the history of India. Whatever might have been the outcome of the struggle, in the long run it was certain that the Muslim majorities in Bengal and North-West of India would have been politically awakened to their own sense of importance. Muslims might have lost their States in those parts of India where they were a minority, but they would have gained a permanent foothold in Bengal and North-West where they were a majority of population.

It is, however, of no use to unravel the past except to learn the lesson that India was never united into one nation, and that prior to the British rule, the political leaders of the Muslims and Hindus struggled for the mastery of power. If the two communities had agreed to mark their spheres of influence and confined their activities to the consolidation of their respective positions in those areas where they were in a majority and were entitled to govern, a common line of action might have been pursued against the new British danger. But India was then a mere geographical expression and no statesman could visualise a future where both communities could live as a united nation.

A similar position confronts India to-day. The Empire is passing through a political crisis. It

is ready to release its hold on India, provided the people come to terms with it on an agreed formula. Hindus or Muslims separately cannot bend the British Government to yield to any of their demands. Unless they unite, the cause for independence is likely to be indefinitely postponed. The political leaders of both the communities have failed to inspire confidence among people other than their own. The Muslims are not prepared to live as a minority community in those provinces where they are in a majority and demand the status of an independent nation. Hindus, on the other hand, wish to keep India united, as in this way alone they can dominate the Centre and control the Muslim Provinces.

The problem, so far as Hindus and Muslims are concerned is very simple and admits of no insuperable difficulties. The Muslims form one-fourth of the total population of India and number 90 millions. It is nothing less than political jugglery to treat such a big community as a minority for the sake of a united India which never existed in the past and which does not appeal to the Muslim political mind. There is no precedence among independent countries of to-day where such a big minority exists.

In Europe there is hardly any country with a minority exceeding one or two millions in number. The German Empire of to-day has under it many non-German peoples, Poles, Czechs, Danes, etc., but this is not considered a permanent solution of the

problem. The primary object of the present war in fact is to liberate these minorities from German rule.

European statesmen after the last Great War made a serious effort to settle the minority problem. The word "minority" was given a definite interpretation. It was subjected to two clear definitions. If a minority is scattered in a country, and does not form a compact majority by itself in any well-defined geographical part, it can only be assured of safeguards for the protection of its religion, language and culture. Conversely, if a minority occupies a compact area in a country, forming majority of its population, it is entitled to separate independent existence. The Magyars in Rumania, the Croats in Jugoslavia, the Poles in pre-war Germany, the Muslim Tatars in European Russia numbered more than a million each, but as they did not occupy compact areas in their respective countries so they were assigned the status of minorities. Muslims in European Russia are a majority in Crimea, Kalmuk, Bashkir, Daghestan, Kazan and number over 5 millions and yet they are treated as a minority community for the obvious reason that they are scattered over areas which are not contiguous. The Magyars occupy compact areas inside the Transylvanian Province of Rumania, and yet they are deprived of the status of an independent nation.

On the same lines, the Sikhs are a minority in the Punjab, numbering 3 millions, and can only be assured of protection of religion, language and culture like the minorities in European countries

If they are conceded the status of an independent nation, the Muslims in Hindu Provinces like U. P. where they are double the number of Sikhs, in Bihar and Assam where they exceed Sikhs and in Madras and Bombay where they are slightly lower in population than the Sikhs in the Punjab, will also have to be conceded the status of independent nations.

A minority, however, can claim the status of an independent nation only when it is settled in a well-defined and compact geographical region. European statesmen in 1919 were clearly alive to this fact when they broke up the Austro-Hungarian Empire into a number of separate States and recognised the independence of five States on the western border of Russia.

The Finns, the Esthonians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians and the Poles lived before the last war as minorities in European Russia. Their countries formed part of Russia and were linked together with it by means of communications and other economical factors. The entire Russian foreign trade of the Baltic Sea passed through the seaports on the western coast. Yet it was deemed necessary to establish five independent States in the west of Russia. By a simple readjustment of Russian administrative Provinces, new States were created and the minorities were converted into majorities.

There was, however, one essential condition which entitled these minority peoples to claim

independence. This was the fact that they were not scattered in small numbers over a big area, but were concentrated in compact areas of well-defined limits where they formed a majority of population. Here in India, if the principle of self-determination is applied, the present 11 Provinces will clearly be recognised as well-defined geographical units, entitled to claim full independence if the people so demand.

It is simply confusing the issues when the Sikhs put up their case in the category of the Muslim community of India. If the Muslims of Hindu India where they number over 25 millions can be content to live under a Hindu majority rule at the Centre, there is no reason why the Sikhs with a numerical strength of 3 millions should not be content with their status in the Muslim Federation of the North-West.

The Sikhs should learn the lesson from other countries. A minority so small in numbers, and scattered over different parts of one country, cannot attain the status of an independent nation. As I have stated above, the Magyars in Rumania, the Muslim Tartars in European Russia, the Jews in pre-war Poland, the Croats in Jugo-Slavia can by no stretch of imagination be allowed to have independent States. The Jews numbered 3 millions in Poland before Germany invaded the country, but it was never conceded that they could ever claim the status of an independent nation. Similarly

the Muslim Tartars in European Russia, who number 5 millions, cannot claim the status of an independent nation. The Sikhs are a minority in the strict sense of the word and their future is irrevocably connected with Muslim North-West, where they will be assigned the status of an important minority with special rights and privileges over and above their numerical strength. The Muslims are serving the cause of the real Punjab when they claim separation for it as in this way alone the Punjabis can dominate the proposed North-West Federation,

The Punjab can play no important part in a United India where its interests will be inadequately defended at the Centre and where it will lose its present position as an independent economic unit. The creation of a bigger Punjab with natural expansion in the North-West and South, so as to include Kashmir, the Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan, is in reality the regeneration of the old historical kingdom which the Sikhs tried to keep united in their time of glory and which now will be supported by the combined might of Muslims and Sikhs. A true Punjabi should always try to place the interests of his country first and should never agree to see his country fall from its real position. The Punjab as a dominant partner in a Federation of the North-West will be the master of its own house and will exert her full force at the Centre.

It will have a commanding voice in determining the problems that will affect its own future and

will control the army, the navy, air and other defence services in proportion to its population. Can it be expected in case of a united India, that the Punjab will play the dominant part? Already the present monopoly of the Punjab in the army has been challenged and the time is not far when the Sikh and Muslim elements in the army will be reduced to insignificance. Similarly the economic interests of the Punjab are bound to come into conflict with Hindu India. The Punjab's future lies in the pursuit of an economic policy which will pay due regard to the interests of its agricultural population composed mainly of Muslims and Sikhs and also encourage industry and trade so as to prevent these from becoming the sole monopoly of a single class, i.e. the Hindu Bania. The country will be a loser all round and will be at the mercy of the capitalists of Hindu India if it accepts a system of government at the Centre where its voice will be comparatively ineffective.

Politically, geographically and economically, the Punjab has more in common with Kashmir, the Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind than with the rest of India. The entire North-West is a distinct natural region fertilised by the Indus and its five tributaries. It has separate drainage and railway systems. It has a separate outlet in Karachi through which the bulk of its foreign trade passes. It is separated from the rest of India by the river Jumna and the deserts of Rajputana. If a barrier were raised on the eastern boundary of the Punjab and all communications were stopped with the rest

of India, there would be no great effect on the economic life of the people. Whatever Punjab wants to obtain from the West, it can have through Karachi. Its exports have a natural outlet in the south-west. It is in fact a complete well-defined geographical unit raising no administrative difficulties on its separation from the rest of India.

2. *The League Solution*

The Lahore Resolution of the All-India Muslim League lays down the basic principles underlying the solution of the minority problem in India. It recommends adequate, effective, and mandatory safeguards for minorities in the predominant Muslim areas in the North West and East of India for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests, in consultation with them."

On a similar reciprocal basis, the resolution demands that "in other parts of India where the Mussulmans are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specially provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them."

It is obvious that the Muslim League offers the same constitutional safeguards to non-Muslim minorities in the two proposed Pakistan States that it demands for Muslim minorities in other parts of India where Hindus are in a majority. The resolution is unambiguous and frank in defining the scope of the constitutional safeguards which comprise almost every thing that could be considered essential to the protection of the rights of a minority.

Before analysing the significance and the far reaching-effect of the constitutional safeguards as envisaged in the Lahore Resolution, it will facilitate the correct understanding of the problem to expose the hollowness of criticisms that are levelled from hostile quarters against the resolution. It is said that the Lahore Resolution does not make a real contribution to the solution of the minority problem in India as minorities are bound to exist both in Muslim and Hindu parts of India after the creation of the Pakistan states; that the same constitutional safeguards as are offered to minorities in Pakistan states and the rest of India can be offered to Muslims in a united India where they will be treated as a specially favoured minority; that the reciprocal basis on which constitutional safeguards have been laid down in the resolution cannot be maintained after India has been split up into independent sovereign States as international law prevents one State from interfering in the internal affairs of another.

All these objections are made in a partisan spirit to confuse the real issue, which is that the Muslims being a separate nation are entitled to the right of self-determination in those compact and well-defined parts of India where they are in a majority. The All-India Muslim League has offered a workable solution of the minority problem; and under the circumstances the League offers the only possible solution. If the Congress, Hindu Mahasabha or any other political organisation has any other alternative or scheme which can win the

good will of the vast majority of Muslims, the latter are prepared to consider it on its merit. So far the Congress and Mahasabha have absolutely failed to convince the Muslims that their interests can better be served by demanding Federation than Separation.

The Mahasabha Scheme is too well-known to deserve any special notice. It envisages a united India where Hindus will possess the rights of a sovereign nation and all other communities, including Muslims, will be assigned the status of permanent minorities. It further anticipates a strong government at the centre with unfettered control over the Provinces, so as to leave no chance to Muslim Provinces to claim separation in future. Dr. Moonji, a prominent Mahasabha leader, defined in a speech at Bezwada on December 24, 1940, the objects of Hindu Nationalism in these words, "The nationalism hitherto preached by the Indian National Congress is hybrid and unscientific and the Hindu Mahasabha holds before the Hindu nation the prospect of the Hindu nationalism, Hindu rule and Hindu kingdom. To achieve this, the Hindu Mahasabha rightly believes that violence is the effective weapon."

The Congress Scheme also presupposes a united India, but it differs from the Mahasabha Scheme in its approach to the minority problem. Whereas the Mahasabha admits that Hindus and Muslims are separate nations and that Hindus being in a majority in India are alone entitled

to possess the rights of a sovereign nation, the Congress ignores that there is any minority in India in the political sense and openly asserts that Hindus and Muslims, being members of a common Indian nation, must work together for a Federal Government at the centre which will control such important matters as Defence, Communications, Foreign Affairs, Customs, Currency, etc. The Congress believes that a constitution based on democratic principles, and representing all elements of India's population on the basis of adult franchise, will satisfy the best interests of the country as a whole. .

It is, however, utterly blind to the fact that a democratic constitution presupposes a homogeneous nation which does not exist in India. You cannot force the Finns to live together with Russians under a common constitution, simply because democracy in their case means acceptance of permanent domination by Russians. For a similar reason, the Irish Catholics do not want to live as members of a common British nation, as their interests can better be safeguarded by their own independent Government than by even an excessive representation over and above their population ratio in the British Parliament. No nation can ever remain satisfied with constitutional safeguards and other political concessions when it is conscious of its own importance and is determined to defend its interests uninterfered with by others.

I now return to the main objections. The Lahore resolution undoubtedly presupposes the

existence of minorities in Pakistan States and Hindu India, but that does not mean it makes no attempt to solve the minority question. In a united India, 90 millions of Muslims are left permanently as a minority community. No government, however strong it may be, can keep attached to its cause such a strong element of its subjects who will ever be ready on the first favourable opportunity to disown their allegiance. There is no modern country which presents minority problem in such an acute form as India.

The League Resolution reduces the Muslim minority of 90 millions to less than 30 millions by assigning to the rest separate homelands where it will be master of its own house.

Obviously, a country can be more efficiently governed if it has to face the opposition of a minority scattered over a wide distance than a minority concentrated in compact parts and capable of threatening its very existence. With the separation of the Muslim predominant areas of the North-West and the East, the proportion of Hindus will rise from 70 p.c. at present to 90 p.c. in the rest of India, while the Muslim minority will be reduced from 25 p.c. to 10 p.c.

Is this not a tremendous gain for Hindu India? The stability and peace of India can only be best assured if the discontented parts are separated from it. India is too big to suffer any appreciable material loss by the separation of one fourth of its total area and population. Hindu India, with a

population of about 280 millions after the creation of the two Pakistan States, can yet possess sufficient resources and means to play an effective part as an independent state. Thus it is apparent that the League resolution does not aggravate the minority problem; rather it removes the sting from it and reduces it to the narrowest possible limits.

To the objection that if constitutional safeguards can satisfy the minorities after the creation of Pakistan, why don't they satisfy the Muslim minority in India as a whole, the right answer is that the Muslims are not a minority in the sense in which minorities exist in other countries. More than 50% of them live in two distinct zones of India where judged by every modern test, they are entitled to the rights of a sovereign nation. Constitutional safeguards can satisfy a minority which has no other alternative but to accept them. A minority which does not muster strong in any recognised part of a country and is numerically weaker everywhere than the majority community, cannot claim the status of an independent nation.

Take the example of Jews in Poland prior to this war. Out of a population of 36 millions, the Jews formed 13% in Poland, exactly in the same proportion as the Sikhs are in the Punjab, yet as they were not in a majority in any compact part of Poland, they could not demand independence and had to be satisfied with constitutional safeguards.

The objection in question has arisen out of the misinterpretation of the term "minority." A true

minority always remains a minority in spite of any geographical adjustments that may be made to secure for it a distinct and separate home-land. But a minority which can be converted into a majority in any recognised part of a country cannot be called a true minority and hence must be entitled to the right of self-determination.

The break-up of Czarist Russia and Austro-Hungarian Empires after the last war into a number of independent states was the direct result of the recognition of this principle. The pre-war, minorities became independent nations in the post-war period. The Poles, the Czechs, the Magyars, the Jugo-Slavs, the Austrians, the Esthonians, the Latvians, Lithuanians and the Finns were recognised as minorities before 1914 in Europe, but in 1919 they had come into existence as independent nations.

The 3rd objection is that after the partition of India into independent States, there will be no guarantee that the latter will not abrogate the constitutional safeguards, and leave the minorities unprotected. Undoubtedly international law prevents one State from interfering in the affairs of another. The objection however ignores the complete change of heart that will take place after the partition of India. Hindus and Muslims will respectively be secure and free in the enjoyment of the full sovereign rights to which they will be entitled on population basis. The minorities will cease to claim more than what has been fixed as their due share

on the basis of a mutual understanding freely arrived at prior to the partition of India.

The Muslim minority of Hindu India will in due course become content with its lot, and cease to look to the Muslims beyond for help. It will have the mental satisfaction that the Muslims in their majority provinces are in unfettered control of their destinies and that it must accept the role of a minority as there is no other moral or legal alternative to it. Similarly, the Hindus in the Pakistan States will pursue their occupations peacefully, and will cease to look to Hindu India for help.

As a measure of restoring confidence and as a precaution that constitutional safeguards will be strictly adhered to, Pakistan and Hindu India Governments can sign a mutual pact of good will and understanding and provide some suitable machinery, may be through an independent tribunal, for arbitration in cases of dispute when a minority is suspected of being tyrannised over by a majority.

The system of checks and balances that is the essential basis of the League resolution is the ideal solution under the existing conditions.

If it is supposed for a moment that it cannot work with success how much more it is true if the entire Muslim nation is placed as a minority in a united India under the domination of a permanent Hindu majority. Trust begets trust. If Hindus can trust the Muslims for the protection of non-

Muslim minorities in Pakistan States, Muslims can equally trust the Hindus for the protection of Muslims and other minorities. The League resolution rests on the mutual good will of the two nations, Hindus and Muslims; it does not place undue strain on the good-will of one nation alone. The Congress, on the other hand, wants Muslims as a whole to be satisfied with constitutional safeguards and to depend for their enforcement on the good-will of the majority community. There is no check on the latter if it adopts an attitude of aggression in its dealings with Muslims.

The sincerity of the League is evident from the fact the it bases relations between the majority and minority communities on a reciprocal understanding. 'Do to others as you wish to be done by' is its motto. It concedes in clear terms to minorities in Pakistan what it claims for minorities in Hindu India. Can the Congress offer a better alternative to satisfy the minorities?

3. North Western Muslim Zone

A careful examination of the territorial limits of Pakistan will reveal that the minority problem admits of an easy workable solution. The All India Muslim League defines in its Lahore resolution the broad principle on which Muslim parts of India are to be separated. It does not actually draw any line of demarcation to indicate the boundary limits of the two Pakistan States envisaged by it.

The north-western zone of India comprises the Provinces of the Punjab, Sind the N.W.F. Province, Baluchistan and the Kashmir State and includes all the Indian states that lie within this zone. The total population of this zone is estimated at 39½ millions according to the census of 1921. Muslims form 23½ millions or 60 per cent of the population. The figures are given below:

	Total population	Muslim
Punjab	23,580,852	13,332,460
Sind	3,887,070	2,830,809
N. W. F. P.	2,425,076	2,227,303
Br. Baluchistan	463,508	405,309
Kashmir	3,646,243	2,817,636
Punjab States } Agency }	4,472,218	1,556,591

Punjab States	437,787	40,845
N. W. F. Agencies	46,451	23,086
<hr/>		
Total	39,364,314	23,626,821
<hr/>		

The proportion of Muslim population ranges from 70 per cent to 90 per cent in four out of the five main units of Pakistan i. e., in Sind, N. W. F. P., Baluchistan and Kashmir. It is only in the Punjab and its states that the proportion of Muslim population falls below 57 per cent. But the problem in the Punjab too is not so acute as the community wise strength of its three major communities shows. In the Punjab, the Hindus form 27 per cent and Sikhs 13 per cent as against 57 per cent Muslims. The proportion of Hindu population in the Punjab is the highest in the six districts of Ambala Division and Hoshiarpur and Kangra districts of Jullundur Division. The Sikhs do not muster strong in any district to form an absolute majority, but they are mainly concentrated in four districts i. e., Ludhiana, Jullundur, Ferozepur and Amritsar. Their highest population is in Ludhiana where it reaches above 40 per cent. Muslims form a majority in 16 out of 29 districts of the Punjab, of which 6 each are represented in Rawalpindi and Multan Divisions and 4 out of 6 in Lahore Division. In Gurdaspur, Amritsar, Jullundur and Ferozepur the Muslims are the largest single community and are only excelled by the Hindu and Sikh population combined.

Ethnographically, the Punjab proper extends up to the northern limits of the Ambala Division which, differs from the rest of the Punjab in the language, customs and religious proclivities of the people.

Ambala Division is, truly speaking a predominant Hindu area and can be merged into U. P. or joined to Delhi as a new Province. Most of the Hindu and Sikh states of the Punjab lie south of the Jullundur Division. These can also be excluded with advantage from the Punjab. Thus shorn of Ambala Division and the states of Patiala, Nabha, Jind and Faridkot as well as the states of Simla Hills, Sirmur and Kalsia, the population of the Punjab will be reduced by 7 millions, and the proportion of Muslim population be raised from 57 per cent, to 66 per cent. The tables given below explain this point :—

(A) Population at present		Population after the Exclusion of Ambala Division and Hindu States.
Punjab Proper	23½ million	19½ millions
Punjab States	5 millions	2 millions.
Total	28½	21½

(B) Community-wise population in millions.

[At Present]			[After the Exclusion of Ambala Division and Hindu States].		
Muslims	Hindus	Sikhs,	Muslims	Hindus	Sikhs
Punjab 13.3	6.3	3	12.3	3.5	2.8

States	1.6	2.2	1	1.2	.6	2
Total	14.9	8.5	4	13.5	4.1	3

It will be evident from the above tables that while the proportion of Hindu population will be reduced from 27 p. c. to 19 p. c. after the exclusion of Ambala Division and the states south of Jullundur Division, the proportion of Sikh population will not be appreciably affected. On the other hand in the Punjab proper, exclusive of states, the Sikh proportion will be raised from 12.9 p. c. to 14.8 p. c.

After the re-adjustment of the Punjab frontiers, the total population of the North-Western Muslim Zone will be reduced from $39\frac{1}{2}$ millions to $32\frac{1}{2}$ millions, but the Muslim proportion will be raised from 60 p. c. to 69 p. c. If the independent tribal territory is also added to it, the proportion of Muslim population will rise still higher and may reach 71 p. c. In the Punjab proper the Muslim proportion will be raised from 56 p. c. to 66 p. c.

The Hindu case in the Muslim North Western Zone does not present any difficulties. The Hindus are a minority every-where, and can be assured of constitutional safe-guards. If Muslims remain united, their Government in the proposed five units of Pakistan as well as in the centre can never be challenged or threatened by the Hindu minority. In the N. W. F. P. and Baluchistan, the Hindus will always be a minority of less than 10 p. c. In Kashmir and Sindh, their proportion will range between 25 and 30 per cent. In the Punjab after

the exclusion of the Ambala Division their proportion will be barely 19 p. c. In the entire North-Western Muslim Zone, the Hindus will form 18 p. c. of the total population.

The Sikh case requires some explanation. The Sikhs at present enjoy 20 p. c. representation in services as well as in the Provincial Legislature. The Pakistan Government will continue the weightage at present enjoyed by them, and will also assure them of adequate representation over and above their population ratio in the Centre. At present Sikhs form 1 p. c. of the total population of India, but in the proposed Muslim State their proportion will be 9 p. c. and they will be guaranteed a permanent seat in the Central Cabinet. In the Punjab proper, they will also hold a position of vantage and will be represented by an equal number of Ministers along with Hindus.

There is a section among Sikhs which is dreaming of parcelling out an independent Sikh State from the Punjab, but this impracticable plan is not warranted by any rational consideration. S. Ujjal Singh is said to have conceived a scheme under which five districts of the Punjab can be grouped into a separate province and be placed under a government representative of the three major communities in equal proportions. According to him, in each of these districts, none of the three communities commands an absolute majority and as these districts represent the greater part of Sikh population, the Sikhs will feel secure in the

enjoyment of their civic rights. The table below will give the Proportion of Muslim and Sikh population in the five districts,

District	Total Population	Muslims	Sikhs
Gurdaspur	9,70,798	50 p. c.	14.5 p. c.
Amritsar	11,17,120	46.9	29
Jullundur	9,45,721	44.5	22
Ferozepur	11,56,642	44.8	27
Ludhiana	6,72,494	35.1	40
Total	48,60,875	45 p. c.	25 p. c.

The figures supplied above will show that the Muslim proportion in the proposed province will be still very strong, i. e., 45 p. c. of the total. No Ministry or Government will be able to function successfully without the cooperation of the Muslims.

Further the Sikhs will lose all excessive representation in services and the Provincial Legislature at present enjoyed by them. In the new Province, the Muslims will not tolerate any concession as this will reduce their effective strength,

Apart from this, the new State will be a centre of intrigues both from Hindu India and Muslim States and will never enjoy internal peace and a stable government. The acceptance of this scheme will moreover, lead to a series of counter-demands from Muslims in the Hindu majority provinces, particularly by Moplas in Malabar and the Muslims in the U. P. who form 14 p. c. of the

total population and can base their claims like the Sikhs on their political and historical importance.

The U. P. is a centre of Muslim culture and thought. It was directly under Muslim rule prior to its annexation by the British. The Aligarh University, the Deoband College, the Nadva-tul Ulum, all remind us of the achievements of Muslim in secular and religious education while the Taj Mahal and many other buildings are living monuments of Muslim architecture and civilisation.

The Muslims of the U.P. form $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of the total urban element and are also strongly represented in the landed aristocracy. They carry as much influence with the Provincial Government as the Sikhs do in the Punjab. Hence the Sikhs cannot be supported in their demand for a separate province, as this will lead to a piecemeal division of India which will neither be agreed to by Hindus nor by the British Government.

The true role of the Sikhs lies as a minority, secure in the enjoyment of special rights guaranteed to them under the constitution. Some of these rights may be mentioned below:—

1. No Bill affecting the Sikh religion shall be passed in any of the Provincial Legislatures under the Pakistan Federated State unless the same is supported by two-thirds of the Sikh members.

2. Provision will be made for the teaching of Gurmukhi, the language of Sikh scriptures, in

all the schools where there is a demand on the part of Sikh students as a second language.

3. Sikh Gurdwaras will be managed by a Central Sikh Committee without interference by Government.

4. Sikhs will be allotted 20 p.c. share in all the services under the Punjab Government.

5. Sikh representation in the Punjab Assembly will continue to be 20 p.c. of the total number of elected members.

6. Sikh will be represented in the Punjab Cabinet by one-fifth of the total strength.

7. The Sikh share in services under the Pakistan Federal Government and also in the Federal Cabinet will be fixed at no less than 10 p.c. of the total.

8. Sikh share in the army, navy or air personnel recruited out of the Punjab will be fixed at 20 p.c.

The above list is not an exhaustive one, but it suggests some lines on which safeguards can be provided in the constitution.

9. One more point concerning the N.-W Muslim Zone deserves special notice. The zone includes many Indian states of which the most important are Kashmir, Bahawalpur, Ka'at, Khairpur,

Chitral, Chamba, Mandi Suket, Bilaspur, Kapurthala and Malerkottra. Of minor importance are the states or tribal agencies in the N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan. All these states will be represented in the Pakistan Federal Assembly as independent and autonomous units. The Pakistan Government will not interfere in their internal affairs and will only exercise control over matters specially delegated to it with the consent of their rulers. These matters will include defence, foreign affairs, communications, customs and currency.

So far as the Muslim states are concerned, the consent of their rulers will be easily obtained. But some difficulty will be experienced in winning over Hindu and Sikh States. The States of Kashmir and Kapurthala, though ruled by Sikh Rajas, are predominantly Muslim in population. They are bound to be influenced by the pressure of public opinion in joining the Pakistan Federation.

It is only the four Hindu hill States of Chamba, Mandi, Suket and Bilaspur which, in view of their predominantly Hindu population, may for a time decide to stand apart. Mandi is the most important of these states, as its Uhl River furnishes water supply for the Punjab Hydro-Electric Scheme. Economic considerations, however, are bound to move the rulers of these States to join Pakistan Federation. These states are practically isolated from the rest of India and can be approached only through the Punjab. The Chamba State is connected with Gurdaspur district through the

outpost of Dalhousie. Mandi, Suket and Bilaspur maintain their contact with the Punjab through Kangra and Hoshiarpur districts. Thus it will be evident that if shut off from the Punjab, these States will lose all their economic and political importance; so in their own interest, the rulers of these states will have to align their fate with Pakistan.

4. The Eastern Muslim Zone

The Eastern Pakistan State will comprise the greater part of Bengal and also the Sylhet and Goalpara Districts of Assam. The total area of this new State will be 70,000 square miles, with an estimated population of 40 millions. Muslims will form a majority of 70 p. c. in this State.

Bengal and Assam, as at present constituted, have together a total area of 137,391 square miles with a population of 59 millions according to the census of 1931. Muslims form 54.1 p. c. of the population in Bengal and 31.4 p. c. in Assam.

The total Muslim population in Bengal and Assam together is more than one-third of the total Muslim population of India. According to the census of 1931, there were 66½ million Muslims in British India and 10½ millions in Indian States. Bengal and Assam together returned a Muslim population of 31 millions or just a little less than half the Muslim population of British India.

There are some special advantages which the Eastern Pakistan State possesses when compared with the Western Pakistan State. Firstly, the Muslim population in the Eastern Pakistan State is entirely homogeneous not merely in respect of religion, but also in respect of race, language, dress, customs and all other distinctive marks of a nation.

In the Western Pakistan State, within the State there will be many autonomous and independent units representing Pathans, Baluchis, Sindhis, Kashmiris and Punjabis whose essential link will be religion and common political and economic interests; but in the Eastern Pakistan State, the entire Muslim population will be united as one compact and homogeneous group. In case of Western Pakistan, we conceive of a Federation with residuary powers vested in autonomous units, but the Eastern Pakistan State will have a unitarian constitution with a strong and powerful centre. The question of separate autonomous units does not arise, as the Muslim population of Bengal and Assam is all one by religion, race, language and culture.

Moreover, Federation is considered a necessity for a State extending its sovereignty over a large area, made up of well-defined administrative units, but it is never in demand where a compact and homogeneous population is crowded into a comparatively small area. As against a total area of 3,81,000 square miles, in case of the Western Pakistan State, the Eastern State will have an area of 70,000 square miles or less than one-fifth of the former.

Again the Western Pakistan State has to face a complex question of minorities, in the different units that will form its federating parts. There will be important Hindu minorities in Sindh, the Frontier Province, Kashmir, and th

addition, it will have to deal with the problem of the Sikhs and Indian States. The Sikhs represent 13 per cent of the population of the Punjab but claim an excessive representation in services and the provincial legislature. The number of states, no doubt, will be reduced after the exclusion of the Hindu and Sikh states lying South of Jullundur Division, but still new problems will arise by the inclusion of Kashmir, Kapurthala, and the hill states of Chamba Mandi, Suket and Bilaspur.

The Eastern Pakistan State will be comparatively free from such problems of a complicated nature. It will have to deal with one minority in the main and only one state, Tippera, will be included within its bounds. The Hindu minority in Eastern Pakistan State will undoubtedly be very strong, being 30 p. c. of the total population, but as the Muslim majority has close affinities with it in respect of race, language, and customs, it will in due course be united with it by bonds of common interests.

But if despite the conciliatory policy of the state, the Hindu minority still remains dissatisfied, mutual exchange of population with Muslims in Bihar and excluded districts of Bengal and Assam can easily be arranged.

The main difficulties in exchange of population are the distance and differences in standard of living of the people exchanged. But both these difficulties will not present permanent barriers in this state. The Bengalee Hindu in the Eastern Bengal shows

no marked difference in the standard of living from the Bengalee Hindu in Western Bengal or in Assam. Similarly, the Muslim population of Bihar bears close affinity to that in Bengal; the distances too are not prohibitive. The whole of Bengal is as big as the State of Kashmir, Bihar is smaller in size than Sindh while Assam is slightly bigger than it. Hence an exchange of population which will involve Bengal, Assam and Bihar will not be quite impracticable. It will at the utmost concern 5 or 6 million Hindus and Muslims each way,

I do not, however, suggest an exchange of population as the only solution of the minority problem. The question will never arise in a state where minorities have been properly protected through constitutional safeguards. This applies with greater force to a statelinked together by ties of language and common customs and ways of living. But the possibility can only arise if the Bengalee Hindu shows a desire to exchange with Muslims living in the excluded districts of Western Bengal and Assam or Bihar.

When I have mentioned the advantages which the Eastern Pakistan State possesses over the Western Pakistan State, I should not omit to mention the one great disadvantage that the former will have to face. Eastern State will have a dense population of 40 millions in a comparatively small area of 70,000 square miles. This gives an average of 571 persons per square mile. As the State will be bounded by Assam in the East and Bihar in the

west, it will have no possibilities of expanding its population.

In due course, the population problem will confront it as a major issue. Either the State will have to be industrialised to divert the pressure of population on land or some arrangements will have to be made with Hindu India or the neighbouring sparsely populated Muslim islands of Borneo, Sumatra, Celebes etc, for the emigration of the surplus population.

It is in view of this difficulty that some persons suggest that the Eastern Pakistan State should comprise the whole of Assam as it will provide in this way abundant scope for the absorption of its surplus population, Eastern Bengal is gradually expanding. The Assam and Surma Valleys of Assam in the past have received a constant flow of immigrants from Eastern Bengal, and if no restrictions are placed on future immigration into Assam, in due course, the Bengalee element in its population will entirely dominate the native Assamese. Even now the Bengalese form a majority of population in Assam.

There is, however, one difficulty in including Assam as a whole. The proportion of the minority population will be raised from 30 to 38 percent or more immediately if the Eastern Pakistan State includes the whole of Assam. The alternative of keeping the Muslim proportion intact by excluding the greater part of Western Bengal deprives the new State of the seaport of Calcutta as well as several rich

districts. Moreover, it will not be possible to defend the inclusion of the whole of Assam in the state on the principle of self-determination.

A district-wise survey of the population of Bengal and Assam will clearly show that Muslims are mainly concentrated in Eastern Bengal and in 4 out of 11 districts in Western Bengal. They are also a majority in the Sylhet district of Assam and an important minority of 48 per cent. in Goalpara district. Both these districts can be excluded from Assam to form part of the new Eastern Pakistan State. There are at present 3½ million Muslims in Assam, and out of these 2 millions are concentrated in Sylhet and Goalpara area. I give below the district-wise proportion of Muslim population in Bengal and Assam :—

Eastern Bengal

Chittagong	76·7	„
Nawakhali	76·5	„
Tippera	76	„
Dacca	69·8	„
Mymensingh	76·6	„
Bakargunj	72·4	„
Faridpur	65·1	„
Pabna	76·9	„
Bogra	83·5	„
Rajshahi	75·7	„
Rangpur	71	„
Dinajpur	50·5	„
Malda	54·2	„

Eastern Bengal		
Jalpaiguri	23.9	"
Darjeeling	2.5	"
Western Bengal		
Murshidabad	55.5	"
Nadia	61.6	"
Jessore	62	P. C.
Khulna	49.3	"
Calcutta	25.9	"
24 Parganas	34.6	"
Hoogly	17	"
Burdwan	18.9	"
Birbhum	26.6	"
Bankura	4.7	"
Midnapur	7.5	"
ASSAM		
Sylhet	59.2	"
Goalpara	42.8	"
Cachar	33	"
Nowgong	31.1	"
Kamrup	24.9	"

In the remaining districts, Muslim proportion of the population is below 15 p. c.

It will follow from the above that Muslims form a majority in 13 out of 15 districts which formed Eastern Bengal in the former Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam. In Western Bengal, the Muslims are a clear majority in 3 out of 11 districts; just below 50 p. c. in Khulna district and a very important minority in Calcutta and 24-Parganas. In Assam Muslims hold their own in Sylhet and Goal-

para and are an important minority in 3 other districts. Thus on the basis of Muslim population, 13 districts of Eastern Bengal, 3 of Western Bengal, and Sylhet district of Assam form a compact Muslim region. To this may be added, the Goalpara District of Assam, by leaving a small corridor in the north to enable the rest of Assam to maintain direct contact with Hindu India through Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling in northern Bengal.

Khulna, Calcutta and 24 Pargana districts of Western Bengal should also be included in the Muslim region as they lie immediately in the south of it and will furnish this region direct access to Sea through Calcutta. In Khulna, Muslims are just below 50 p.c. while in Calcutta and 24-Parganas they are a very powerful minority. The inclusion of these three districts will make the Muslim zone compact, and economically strong.

The excluded areas from Bengal will comprise two northern districts of Eastern Bengal, i.e. Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling, and the State of Cooch Behar; also 5 districts in Western Bengal i.e. Midnapur Hoogly, Bankura, Birbhum, and Burdwan. In these 7 excluded districts the Muslim proportion ranges between 5 p.c. and 27 p.c.

Bengalee Hindus will constitute over 25 p.c. of the total population in the Eastern Muslim zone, and other minorities including Christians, Europeans, Assamese etc., will together be less than 5 p.c. The minorities will be guaranteed special

rights on lines suggested in case of minorities in the Western Pakistan State. The question of language and culture will not present any difficulty as both Hindu and Muslim Bengalees are interested in preserving the Bengalee language which is their mother-tongue. The Government will pursue a policy of non-interference in the religious affairs of the minorities by providing in the constitution that no Bill affecting the religion of a minority shall be moved in the legislature which is not supported by two-thirds of the members of the minority concerned.

The highest appointments in the state will be thrown open to all irrespective of caste colour or creed. Special representation on an agreed basis will be provided for minorities in services and elected bodies. The guiding principle will be the reciprocal basis as laid down in the Lahore Resolution of the All-India Muslim League. If the Muslims concede to Hindus the same rights in their sovereign states as are conceded by Hindus to Muslims in Hindu India, the minorities will no longer distrust the ruling majority, and a spirit of mutual good will and understanding will grow in due course. The Muslim states and Hindu India will thus be moved in their own interest to live at peace and maintain friendly relations with one another.

5. *The Economic Position*

Muslim League demands on the principle of self-determination two Sovereign Muslim States, in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India. These states will correspond in size to the areas represented by Punjab, Kashmir, Sindh, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan in the North-West and the greater part of Bengal and a part of Assam in the East. They occupy important strategic position on the two extreme land frontiers of India, and will be mainly responsible for the defence of India from foreign aggression by land. Before dealing with these states in their economic aspect, some important figures are given below to give an idea of their importance,

Autonomous units	Area in Sq. Miles.	Population. in lacs.	Revenue in lacs.
1. Punjab (excluding Ambala Division.)	84152	194.74	1100
2. Kashmir	84258	36.46	300
3. Sindh	46378	38.87	370
4. N.W.F.P.	13518	24.25	180
5. Baluchistan (including states)	134638	8.68	43.4
6. Frontier Tribal territory	22838	22.59 (not known)	
7. States of Chamba, Munde, Suket, Bilas- pur; Kapurthala and	5895	9.10	79.8

Malerkutla.			
8. Bhawalpur and Khairpur.	21484	12.10	64.3
Total.	<u>413161</u>	<u>346.79</u>	<u>2127</u>
Eastern Pakistan State :-			
1. Bengal excluding districts of Dar- jeeling and Jalpai- guri in the North and 5 districts of Burdwan, Hoogli, Midnapur, Bir- bhum and Bankura in South West.	55600	360	950
2. Sylhet and Goal- para districts of Assam.	9261	37	86
3. Tippera State.	4116	3	29
Total.	<u>68978</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>1065</u>

The figures supplied above will clearly indicate that in area, population and revenue, the two Pakistan States can compare favourably with any of the existing independent Muslim States. The total revenue given does not include the revenue raised by the Central Government from Central sources. The sources of Central revenue are (1) Customs (2) Excise (3) Salt (4) Currency (5) Post and Telegraph (6) Income Tax and (7) Railways. If income under those heads is also calculated for the

two Pakistan States separately, the total revenue from all sources of Western Pakistan State will be raised from 2137 lacs to 3500 lacs and of Eastern Pakistan State from 1065 lacs to more than 3 times the present provincial revenue. Customs, is an important source of income to the two Pakistan States. The revenue raised by Central Government in Sindh under customs, excise, salt and income tax amounts to 566 lacs and in Bengal to 2379 lacs. Figures for income from railways, post and telegraph and currency are not available, but they will also reveal a substantial increase. Hence at a fair estimate, it can be safely said that the total revenue of each of the two Pakistan States will exceed thirty five crores of rupees from all sources. It will be worth while to compare the Pakistan States with the four leading Muslim States:—

Name of State.	Area in Sq. Miles	Popula- tion in millions	Revenue in crores
1. Turkey	294416	18	40
2. Egypt	383000	16	35
3. Iran	628000	15	15
4. Afghanistan	270000	12	9
5. W. Pakistan	413161	35	35
6. E. Pakistan	68971	40	35

In Turkey and Egypt, a large proportion of income is derived from customs and sea transit duties on goods passing through the Dardenelles in Turkey and the Suez canal in Egypt. In the two

Pakistan States, too, a large proportion of the revenue will be obtained from customs collected mainly in the seaports of Karachi and Calcutta.

Here it is necessary to consider what is called the problem of deficit provinces in Pakistan. It is alleged sometimes that the North Western Pakistan State will not be able to meet the expenditure on defence as well as the ordinary expenditure on the maintenance of internal law and order, civil administration and other beneficial departments. It is said in particular, that Sindh, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan can never become self-supporting in view of their poor economic resources. This requires careful examination.

Let us consider first the present position, of each of these areas separately. I take up Sindh first. At present the Central Government advances roughly a crore of rupees to the Provincial Government of Sindh to meet the excess of expenditure over its income. This aid has been fixed for 10 years and at the expiry of the period in 1945, it will be progressively decreased. It has been calculated by financial experts that Lloyd Barrage Scheme will in due course make the Province entirely self-supporting. With proper utilization of the water of river Sindh for irrigation purposes, area under cultivation will rapidly expand in Sindh and will yield to the Government additional income under water taxes and land revenue. But even if Sindh continues in its present condition, it cannot be called a deficit province and deprived

on this basis of its right to independent existence as a member State of Pakistan Federation. The critics who call Sindh a deficit Province forget that it contributes to the Central revenues Rs. 566 lacs under customs and income tax and also a further substantial amount under Railways. If a proportion of income under customs, say 20 per cent is allotted to the provincial Government, Sindh can become entirely self-supporting, irrespective of any developments that may take place under a scheme of agricultural expansion.

The N. W. F. P. and Baluchistan receive together more than a crore and a half rupees from the Central Government. But this aid is not meant for the internal administration of these areas. Figures of gross expenditure for the N. W. F. P. in 1931-32 show that out of an expenditure of Rs 323.47 lakhs, Rs 24.54 lakhs were spent on political work, Rs. 126.10 lakhs on Frontier watch and ward, Rs 34.74 lakhs on Police and Rs. 38.19 lakhs on Civil works. Most of the expenditure incurred has really no concern with the civil administration of the province, and can properly be laid to the account of the Central Government under the head Defence. The revenue actually raised from the province is quite sufficient to meet the ordinary requirements of the provincial Government. The same can be said of British Baluchistan.

The question however may be asked if each Pakistan federation raises sufficient revenue to meet ordinary provincial expenditure, how will the

Central Government function and carry on its responsibility for the defence of the frontiers against aggression. This question will naturally lead us to discuss what are the Central and Provincial subjects, and how should the scope and sphere of each be defined. The Pakistan State is to be a federation of autonomous units. The Centre will be delegated such powers as are agreed upon by the common consent of the Federating units and are considered indispensable for the proper function of the Federal Government. Obviously, Defence, Foreign affairs, Communication, Currency, Post and Telegraph will be the special concern of the Centre, while the autonomous units will possess all residuary powers, not delegated to the Centre. To make the Centre self-supporting, certain sources of revenue will have to be allotted to it. Of these customs, income-tax, excise, salt, railways, posts and telegraphs and currency will form as at present the main sources of income for the Central Government. Assuming that the federating units will be self-supporting, the Central Government of Western Pakistan will be able to raise income under these heads:—

1. Customs	6 crore
2. Railways	5 "
3. Excise	1 "
4. Salt	2 "
5. Income Tax	1½ "
6. Posts and Telegraphs and Currency	½ "

7. Import tax on land frontiers	4 ..
Total	20 ..

Thus approximately a sum of 20 crore rupees will be available to the Pakistan Federation for expenditure on defence and other federal services. Undoubtedly, this income is very small when compared with the normal defence budget of Government of India which comes to not less than 50 crores. But it should be borne in mind that more than 50 % of this expenditure can be curtailed by economising under military allowances and salaries of British troops which form an important element in India's army and also by effecting a general reduction in expenditure. If purely native troops are maintained, and if much of their equipment which is at present purchased from England is produced in India, there will be a tremendous saving in military expenditure.

Further, the government owed its heavy military expenditure in the past to its aggressive Frontier policy. The Pakistan Government will not be alien to the people on the other side of the Frontier and will enter into a mutual pact of peace and good will with Afghanistan. All bitterness which at present prevails in the Tribal Territory against the British Government will disappear. The tribesmen will be appeased by political and economic concessions and will gradually settle down to a peaceful life. If Afghanistan with a limited budget of 9 crores a year can maintain

strong and powerful armies on 3 sides of its frontiers where it has to face Iran, Russia, and India respectively, there is no reason why Pakistan Federation will not be able to maintain stronger armies with twice its total budget from the Central revenues alone.

The Eastern Pakistan State presents no acute Frontier problem. It will however have to maintain armies for defence against Hindu India which will bound it on three sides. As the income under the Central revenues will be twice that raised under the provincial heads, it will be easy for it to manage defence effectively. Figures below will show the proportion of income raised at present in Bengal and Assam under provincial and Central Heads.

Province	Income under Provincial heads in crore	Income under Central Heads. in crore
Bengal	12.76	23.79
Assam	2.58	1.87
Total	15.34	25.87

If the actual boundary limits of the Eastern Pakistan State are taken into consideration, and 7 districts are excluded from Bengal and only Sylhet and Goalpara districts of Assam are included, the income under provincial and central heads will diminish by the $\frac{1}{4}$ th in Bengal and $\frac{2}{3}$ rd in Assam. But still a total of about 11 crores will be left for ordinary internal expenditure and about 19 crores for Central expenditure. Thus Eastern Pakistan State will be competent enough to meet expenditure on

defence and will stand financially on a secure footing.

Both the Pakistan States will remain mainly agricultural at the outset. There is abundant scope for further development of agriculture in the Punjab and Sindh. The forest wealth of Kashmir has yet to be fully exploited. Pastoral occupations will still provide living to a large number of people in Baluchistan and other parts of Pakistan. The soil in Bengal and parts of the Punjab is very rich. The Monsoons secure a plentiful harvest to Bengal while the Punjab and Sindh owe much of their agricultural wealth to their irrigation system through canals. Raw materials and foodstuffs are grown in abundance. The Western Pakistan State not merely raises corn for its own needs, but has also sufficient surplus to export. Raw cotton, oilseeds, hides and skins are other important articles of its exports. The Eastern State produces rice, cotton jute, and tea. Bengal is famous as a jute producing and manufacturing centre.

Industrialization presents favourable prospects in both the States. Bengal seems to have greater opportunities in this respect. The exclusion of some districts in the west will deprive it of much of its coal, but its proximity to the coal mines of Chota Nagpur and Bihar, will enable it to pay a higher price for coal than other Provinces of India remotely placed from Bihar. Jute industry is already responsible for 62% of Bengal's exports. In 1928 there were 85 jute mills with a daily average

of 325, 190 operatives and 12 cotton mills with 12781 operatives. Eastern Pakistan State is sure to become a manufacturing country in due course. There are certain circumstances which specially favour it. A densely populated country with an area comparatively small to its large population besides furnishing a steady flow of labour presents no difficulties of distance and cost of conveyance. Bengal has a moist climate and has an easy access to raw materials both in the home market as well as in the rest of India ; hence it can develop textile industry in cotton besides jute. It is connected through its seaport of Calcutta with all the maritime Provinces of India while it maintains contact by land with Bihar, Orissa and Assam. Hence its central position is also a great asset to it in the encouragement of trade and industry. Calcutta ranks first in the volume of trade that passes through its harbour. Capital and labour are the two essentials for the industrialisation of a country ; these are available to a sufficient extent in Bengal. Jute industry has in the past enriched the Bengal mill-owners while Calcutta in view of its large sea borne and inland trade reckons among its merchants some of the richest in India. Minerals particularly coal and iron can be imported from the neighbouring mines of Bihar, Chota Nagpur and excluded districts of Bengal. The rising population of Eastern Pakistan State will supply an easy home market for the consumption of many of its new industrial products.

Western Pakistan State is not yet fully exploited so far as its mineral wealth is concerned. It is said to be rich in certain minerals. Salt and coal are worked in mines in the western-Punjab while petroleum is also obtained in Attuck District. There is however still much scope for the further discovery and development of oil-wells in Baluchistan and Sindh. Internal resources of Kashmir also require surveying. The Punjab and Kashmir are particularly fortunate in respect of water-power which they can obtain from the rivers as they descend from mountains and from numerous water-falls. Mundi Hydro-Electric Works which derive water power from Uhal river, are alone sufficient to meet the industrial requirements of the whole Province. The cheap supply of electric power will enable the people to utilise forest wealth and mineral resources of Pakistan. The oil-wells recently discovered in Baluchistan and Sindh if properly worked, will be sufficient to meet the demand of the whole of Pakistan.

As I said before, agriculture has still a great scope for expansion. The Lloyd Barrage in Sindh, the Sutluj valley project, Emerson Barrage and Thal Project have released thousands of acres of wasteland for cultivation and in due course, they will help in increasing the total output of agricultural produce to an enormous limit.

Certain parts of Pakistan are suitable for the development of special industries. Baluchistan, N.W.F.P. and Kashmir grow fruit abundantly and

so fruit industry can be developed on business scale. In the hilly districts herboriculture, floriculture and sericulture can be encouraged. Industries based on agricultural products can be developed. Straw-boards can be made from wheat stalk; paper from rice stalk; alcohol from potatoes; cellular and artificial silk from maize stalks and sugarcane refuse.

The Pakistan Government can play an important part in encouraging industry. The State can advance bounties to support new industries in their stage of infancy; it may lend money on easy terms to promote small scale industries; it may establish new factories under its own supervision. It may further impose heavy taxes on manufactured goods from other countries to protect its own industries. The shortage of coal and iron and other minerals may be made good by utilising water power, by working out newly discovered oil-wells and by importing them from abroad. The long distance of the sea-port of Karachi from the inland areas of the north is a great handicap for the development of external trade to the fullest extent but if these areas are connected by air service and by motorable roads and railway lines with the neighbouring countries of Afghanistan, Central Asia, China and Tibet a great stimulus can be given to the development of trade and industry over land. At present the external trade of Kashmir is on a very meagre scale, but with the development of the means of

communication, the products of Kashmir will find new markets beyond the State limits.

We close this narration with the confidence that the proposed Pakistan States will make rapid strides in the economic field, and will besides developing their agricultural wealth, take their place in due course among the advanced industrial countries of the world. Financially, these States will be strong enough to balance their budgets and to meet expenditure under federal responsibilities. The people in general will find sufficient employment in agricultural pursuits, while the urban element in cities and towns will seek new avenues of employment through the development of industry and trade.

PART III

GENERAL CRITICISMS

1. Pakistan & India's Defence

A Hindu Professor in an article in the Civil and Military Gazette, of November 22, draws the conclusion that Hindus will risk the loss of the whole of India in order to prevent Pakistan. He admits that Hindus will have nothing to fear from the establishment of two Muslim States on the borders of India and even advances some fantastic arguments from history to prove that "the Hindu majority living in the rest of India will be able to establish its domination on these two sovereign Muslim States." Naturally one could expect from the confidence that the Professor has in the "vast resources in man power and in the inexhaustible material resources of Hindu India," that he should not display undue nervousness in the future of his country. But one is simply surprised at the strange arguments he chooses to oppose Pakistan. He thinks that the establishment of two Muslim States on the borders of India will make it difficult to defend India against powers such as Germany, Russia and Japan; and will deprive Hindu India of the opportunity to strengthen her defence on her natural frontiers. His second reason is that the

establishment of Pakistan will lead to religious wars between organised sovereign states within the borders of India.

On careful examination it will be evident that this line of reasoning is absolutely misleading. If the desire of every nation to reach strategical frontiers is conceded, many independent nations whose territories are not bounded by natural frontiers will cease to exist. Almost all the states of South America have no natural frontiers to separate one from the other, but their absence does not imply that smaller states like Equador, Paraguay and Uruguay have no right to exist. Similarly, no natural or strategical frontiers can be devised in Europe if small nations who have now been over-powered by Nazi Germany are to regain their independence. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Poland, and a host of other States have no real frontiers worth the name to separate them from their neighbour Germany, but that is no reason to deprive them of their independence. This insistence on strategical frontiers leads a country to Imperialism of the worst type. If one nation seeks expansion at the expense of another, on the plea that its own defence cannot be strengthened without annexing the territory of the other, this will be considered an act of pure aggression by the sane-minded people all over the world. If this right is recognised then the aggressor nation has no limit to its schemes of territorial expansion. If we accept this principle, Germany, Russia and Japan can all be justified in their aggressive designs on their neighbours. To

take a particular example, Soviet Russia considers an independent Finland, a constant danger to its own security as Finland in league with Germany threatens the Russian capital of Leningrad, but this strategic consideration in the interest of Soviet Russia cannot be regarded a sufficient reason to deprive Finns of their independence.

The real remedy to provide security to a country from the threat of danger from outside lies in the establishment of a New World Order in which all nations whether big or small will work in co-operation. Experience has proved that the peace of the world has always been disturbed by the rise of powerful nations. It will be ignoring the lessons of History if powerful nations are allowed to grow unchecked without there being a corresponding arrangement for the protection of their weaker neighbours. If we admit now that the threat from Germany Russia or Japan will be a permanent factor in the future relations of mankind, there will be no justification for the restoration of independent States in Europe after the defeat of Nazi Germany nor it will be desirable to allow the Muslim States of Western Asia to continue in their independent existence. Burma, too, will have no right to demand independence in view of the permanent threat from Japan. Even a united India will be hardly able to stand aggression from outside as has been the case of China which despite its vast resources in manpower and inexhaustible material resources has failed to defend its territories against a far smaller

nation, with population and resources six times less than those of China. This line of reasoning goes against the plea for the complete independence of India as it proves to the hilt that India cannot maintain her independence without the protecting hand of Great Britain whether India is united or divided, it is immaterial as long as strong and powerful nations like Germany, Russia or Japan continue to threaten the peace of the world.

One has to admit plainly that either the danger from powerful nations will be a constant threat to the peace of the world or that it will vanish and give place to a new world order which will recognise the right of every nation big or small to govern itself. If the former view is held, and the Professor seems to be a victim to it at present then the question of divided or undivided India will not solve India's problem of defence. Burma's separation in the East or the creation of two Muslim states on the borders of India will not weaken India's defence. Rather it will range on the side of Great Britain some new States each of which will be determined in the interest of its own security to place at the disposal of the former all her resources. Threat from a common danger will be equally felt by Hindus and Muslims and they will ungrudgingly furnish their respective quotas to ward off the danger that threatens them all alike. The proposed Muslim States along with Burma, Ceylon and other self-governing Dominions will become members of the British Commonwealth of Nations and will be pledged to come to the aid of one

another in the event of danger threatening one or all. Even now the Muslim leaders are alive to the danger from Nazism but they cannot contribute effectively towards victory unless they are given the necessary power to win the confidence of the Muslim public and this is only possible in a scheme of independence which will leave the predominant Muslim areas to determine their own future government.

On the other hand, if the view is held that the New World Order will establish relations between nation and nation on the basis of equality the Hindus will have nothing to fear from the establishment of two sovereign Muslim States. The necessity of securing strategic frontiers will disappear and hence it will become unjustifiable to deprive a nation of its liberty simply on this consideration. The second argument that Pakistan will lead to religious wars between organised states within the borders of India is a gross mis-statement. Hindus and Muslims have lived together in the same state as well as in separate states in the past but History does not record any events where Hindu and Muslim States were simply inspired by religious motives to wage war against each other. The Bahmani Kingdom of Deccan and its five off-shoots were the neighbours of the Hindu state of Vijayanagar but they never fought any battle on the issue of religion. Their wars were the result of the ambitions of the reigning princes. The French after the last war established separate republics for the Muslim and Christian Arabs in

Syria, and though Christians and Muslims were mixed together in both these republics, no quarrels ever arose between them on religious questions. Once it is conceded that a people whether followers of one religion or the other are a majority in a compact area of well-defined limits, they cannot be deprived of the right to self-determination on the flimsy excuse that this will lead to religious wars with their neighbours. If this excuse is held valid, even Afghanistan will not deserve its present independence as it is bound to interfere in the interest of her Pathan citizens and Muslim co-religionists if the latter are ill-treated by the Hindu majority in their fancied scheme of United India.

Pakistan scheme introduces a balanced system of checks. Minorities in Muslim India as well as in Hindu India will, besides being assured of statutory safeguards, be protected on reciprocal considerations. It is quite natural, if Muslim minorities are oppressed in Hindu India, it will lead to repurgations in Muslim India. But the fear of provoking reprisals will exercise a detrimental effect on majorities. The liability before world's moral opinion as well as the responsibility of the oppressing state before the neighbouring state will be quite sufficient to hold in check the danger of communal tension. Supposing for the sake of argument, that the Muslim State will be the aggressor in future, Hindu India will be too powerful to protect the interests of Hindu minorities, and if its repeated warnings do not prove of any avail, it has a right to

conquer and annex Muslim states. It is unstatesmanlike to prejudge an issue in which both sides are equally interested. I see no logic that Hindus should risk the loss of the whole of India to prevent Pakistan when even after its establishment the majority living in the rest of India will be able to establish its domination on the two Muslim sovereign states. If the Hindus are determined to oppose Pakistan even if they will risk the whole of India, the Muslims will be equally strengthened to resist the establishment of a Federal Government even though it may delay the independence of India for ever. The creation of two sovereign Muslim States is the only check upon the aggressive designs of Hindu Imperialists, and if the destruction of this check is the be-all and end-all of their efforts, then the only way to restore confidence of the Muslims is the destruction of aggressive Hindu nationalism which is at the root of the whole mischief and does not recognise the right of any other nation to live under its own terms.

2. *Rajen Babu's Rejoinder to Mr. Jinnah*

[I]

B, Rajendra Prashad, in his rejoinder to a statement issued from Madras on 17th April by Mr. M. A. Jinnah, tries to convince that the two points raised in the statement are quite untenable and open to grave objections. According to him the two points raised by Mr. Jinnah are:—(1) The Congress need not wait for the details of the scheme of Pakistan but should accept the principle forthwith and then the details may be worked out. (2) The Congress is responsible for the failure of negotiations to arrive at a settlement and that the Congress position was most arrogant and dictatorial.

Let us see how the League President puts these points in his own statement and how he argues his case. It will then be proved how the argument advanced by Babu Rajendra Prashad are based on facts and represent a sincere attempt on his part to clarify matters,

As to the first point, Mr. Jinnah thus stated his case: "My attention has been drawn to the statement issued by Babu Rajendra Prashad from Patna on April, 16. I gather that he is not opposed to the basic principles of the scheme of partitioning

India but that he wants full details of the scheme and then alone the Working Committee of the Congress will be pleased to discuss it. Will it not be a more logical course that the Congress should first make up its mind and accept the basic principles laid down in the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League popularly known as Pakistan ? ”

In support of this point, Mr. Jinnah thus proceeds. “Babu Rajendra Prashad with his judicial mind ought to know that first the principle of partitioning India must be agreed upon, then alone comes the question of what ways and means should be adopted to give effect to that decision. The question of details will arise then, and with good will, understanding and statesmanship we shall let us hope, settle them among ourselves. Where there is a will, there is a way. Has Babu Rajendra Prashad known any example where the details have been discussed before, without the principle having been accepted? Even in the case of partition of joint families with which Babu Rajendra Prashad is so familiar, there is either an agreement or a decree and then comes the question how best and equitably to divide the property.”

Continuing his argument, Mr. Jinnah thus lucidly points out, “The latest example in history is that of Ireland. The constitution of north and south Ireland was finally agreed upon after the principles and the basis of division were settled. So was the case with Burma. Similarly the decision to separate

Sind was taken first and then the details of the scheme were considered and given effect to"

To this concise and clear exposition of the case, Babu Rajendra Prashad gives the evasive reply. "I do not know why and how Mr. Jinnah has gathered that I am not opposed to the basic principles of the scheme of partition of India. I want the details of the scheme of partition of India as embodied in the resolution of the Muslim League, to enable me to judge its implications and to understand what I am expected to accept." He denies the analogy of joint Hindu family and asks Mr. Jinnah, "Does he admit that the Hindus and Muslims of India have so far constituted one joint family, and that a partition has now become necessary?"

Like a clever lawyer Babu Rajendra Prashad evades the real issue whether partition is desirable or not by laying emphasis on how the details of partition will be worked out. If, as he says, the Congress has declared more than once that India is one and indivisible, why does he insist on being supplied with details? The obvious conclusion from his reply is that he is keen to know the details in order to create a split in the ranks of Muslims on this point and to reap the benefits of a divide and rule policy. He has disclosed his real motives by his showing in contrast the various schemes concerning the partition of India and by his enquiring, "what are the territories to be included in the two zones?"

The Lahore resolution of the League clearly lays down that "geographically contiguous units should be demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial adjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority, as in the north-western and eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute independent States in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign."

In the light of this resolution, it is easy to know what are the territories likely to be included in the two Muslim zones. The League has not so far given official recognition to any one of the schemes which Babu Rajendra Prashad has referred to in his rejoinder, but it has laid broad outlines which lead to clear results. The North-western zone is bound to include the Punjab, the Frontier Province. Sind. Kashmir and Baluchistan as Muslims form a numerical majority in every one of these units and they are geographically contiguous.

If the Muslims can be a party to any readjustment of frontiers, that can only be in the exclusion of Ambala Division from the Punjab, as it does not form really a part of it. The Punjab proper is the land of the five rivers which fertilise the vast stretch of territory between the Indus and the Sutluj rivers.

The Eastern Muslim zone will comprise the whole of Eastern Bengal, Sylhet and Goalpara Dis-

tricts of Assam and parts of Western Bengal. Here again the readjustment of frontiers is possible but the governing principle will be that all geographically contiguous areas where Muslims are numerically in a majority will be grouped together to form an independent State. The Muslims form one-fourth of the total population of India; they are entitled to claim national homelands in the northern and eastern zones on the basis of their numerical strength.

Babu Rajendra Prashad still seems to be under the delusion that the Muslims are a minority in India on the analogy of Jews in Europe and that India being one indivisible, Muslims cannot be conceded any rights except what the Congress High command may be pleased to confer out of grace and good will. Muslims are not bound to furnish details of the scheme of partition to any third party, unless the same agrees first to recognise the justice of its cause.

Babu Rajendra Prashad, in dealing with the Pakistan case, uses the same argument that is condemned by the Congress when used by the British Government. He wants to know a detailed scheme of partition enjoying popularity among all sections of Muslims. Exactly so Mr. Amery makes it a condition prior to his consent that all the principal elements of India's population should agree on the kind of constitution they want. To repeat Mr. Amery's words, "the framework of India's new constitution should be devised not by the British Parliament, but by Indians themselves and it must

be the outcome of an agreement among the principal elements in India's natural life." If the Congress can insist on independence first and the details of the constitution to be worked out afterwards, it has no right to demand full details of Pakistan scheme first before agreeing to the basic principles underlying it. If Mr. Amery is hypocritical and insincere in his professions, Babu Rajendra Prashad cannot claim immunity from a similar charge. But if it is admitted that the British Government has every right to know how the Indians are likely to agree upon the actual working of the new constitution that they demand, the Congress too as representative of Hindus can claim to know the details of the scheme of Pakistan in so far as they will affect their interests.

Let the Congress first concede that a new constitution should be devised in agreement with the principal elements in India's national life, then alone it can claim the right to know the details of the Pakistan Scheme. Failure to comply with the first condition, on the part of Congress exonerates Muslim League from all responsibility to comply with the second condition.

Just as Babu Rajendra Prashad wants the details of the scheme of partition of India to enable him to judge its implications and to understand what he is expected to accept, in the same strain Mr. Amery can press for the details of a scheme of constitution framed in accordance with Indian conception, Indian conditions and Indian needs to enable him to judge whether it represents the free

consent of all important sections of India and to understand what he is expected to accept.

Babu Rajendra Prashad in his reply to the first point raised by Mr. M. A. Jinnah, further raises some questions which in his opinion admit of no answers. Quoting from "Thoughts on Pakistan," he says that the revenue of Muslim States will be 36 crores and that of the rest of India 120 crores. The revenue of the Muslim States, in his opinion, is not sufficient to maintain a powerful land force, a navy and air force, with all the necessary equipment of a modern army.

Babu Rajendra Prashad should know that this revenue is four times that of Afghanistan and three times that of Persia and will enable the Muslim States to raise a formidable army superior in strength and equipment to that of any neighbouring Muslim country.

Moreover, by entering into non-aggression pacts with the other Muslim States and by following a policy of appeasement towards the frontier tribes, the danger of invasion from north-west will be averted once for all. The real danger to the security of Muslim States can lie from Hindu India.

If Babu Rajendra Prashad thinks that the financial resources of the Muslim States will not enable them to maintain their independence in face of the vast resources of Hindu India, he is really making an attempt to play upon Muslim fears of Hindu might and wants to coerce them into accepting the position of a subject race depending upon

the protection of Hindu India. The Muslims would have never held out the ideal of complete independence before their minds if they had been convinced, as Babu Rajendra Prashad seems to imagine that they would not be able to maintain a modern, army strong enough to defend their states against encroachments from Hindu India. A nation which cannot, maintain its independence by its own strength has no right to live and if in a future combat, after India has achieved independence Muslim states will not be able to hold their own against Hindu India, they will not blame their new victors but will tacitly accept the consequences of their defeat. Babu Rajendra Prashad need not shed crocodile tears on their behalf and feel disappointed at their dire future prospects. Muslims have full confidence in their own patriotic zeal and valour and know well how to defend their hearths and homes against aggression.

A second question raised by Babu Rajendra Prashad is whether Sikhs and Hindus will be recruited in the armies maintained by Muslim states and whether a reciprocal treatment of Muslims will be expected in Hindu India.

The simple reply to this question is that recruitment in the Pakistan Army will be open to all classes of people but the proportion of each community will be fixed on an agreed principle which will be safeguarded by the constitution.

As to the question that reciprocal treatment of minorities is not possible where two states hold

sovereign powers and cannot interfere in the affairs of one another, one may point out that such reciprocal treatment will be guaranteed in the constitution. For example, the Sikhs in the Punjab will be guaranteed certain rights through safeguards in the constitution which will be considered among the Fundamentals of the state. The Muslim state in spite of these special rights of the Sikhs will continue to be sovereign and independent. Similarly the Muslims in Hindu India, will be guaranteed special rights under the constitution.

In cases where a state oppresses its minorities in contravention of the provisions of the constitution which guarantee them protection, it may not be legally possible for a neighbouring state to interfere, but the risk involved in creating internal dissensions will by itself be a sufficient check upon the aggressive policy of the state. The rights of minorities will be guaranteed before the new constitution has come into force and not as Babu Rajendra Prashad seems to think, after the new states have come to function as sovereign and independent states. Muslims insist on the grant of reciprocal rights to minorities as a condition precedent to the forming of new states but once these rights have been guaranteed on a uniform agreed principle, no state will have the legal right to interfere in the affairs of the other. The minorities will have to depend upon the safeguards of the constitution, backed by the goodwill and consent of the majority people.

[II]

As long as minorities will continue to enjoy the special rights as safeguarded under the constitution, the chances of conflict with the majority in power will never arise or if they arise at all through some misunderstanding, will never take a serious turn. In cases, however, where it becomes evident on careful examination, that the majority is bent upon oppressing the minorities, and is acting in clear breach of the constitution, it is open to the latter to use all measures possible in the defence of its own interests. The minorities may even invoke the help of a neighbouring country which is sympathetic to its cause and strong enough to give material assistance.

The case of Sudeten Germans is a clear instance in point. For about 20 years after the last European War, the Sudeten Germans lived under the new State of Czecho-Slovakia, but as the Czechs failed to win over the German minority and followed a programme of nationalisation which endangered the rights of the latter, dissensions arose in the State, and Hitler availed himself of the opportunity to liberate first the German minority and then to annex the whole country. The Czechs discovered only when it was too late that they had failed to appease the minorities in the State. Had they taken into confidence the minorities just when the new State of Czecho-Slovakia came into existence. 20 years

would have been a sufficiently long period in cementing their relations with other nationalities.

There was a clear opportunity for the Czechs to win over the German minority once for all by offering it liberal concessions and by making it feel that its lot was much better than that of its kinsmen in Germany. But unfortunately in the hour of their pride and glory, the Czechs openly trampled upon the rights of these minorities and made systematic efforts to enforce Czech language and culture in German-speaking parts of the country. Had the Czechs pursued a liberal policy towards the minorities, it is possible to think that Hitler would not have been furnished an excuse for interference and the course of European history might have been changed. Hitler in 1938 was not yet a terror for Europe nor could it be anticipated, on the authority of the best military experts of the time, that Germany was strong enough to throw into a turmoil the whole of Europe. The discontented German minorities in Czecho-Slovakia and Poland were not yet prepared to see their kinsmen in Germany involved in a world war for their sake, the consequences of which would be equally disastrous for all. Those who think Germany was bound to interfere in the name of German minorities in the affairs of her neighbouring States, however liberal concessions might have been granted to them, ignore this important aspect of the question that the German minorities in Czecho-Slovakia and Poland would not have clamoured for their separation, had they been assured of full

protection of their interests in the States in which they lived. Their contentment would have exercised a restraining influence upon the ambitions of Germany, and might have spared other countries the ravages of disastrous war.

Babu Rajendra Prashad is utterly wrong in supposing that safeguards for minorities will be exercised only on reciprocal consideration in Hindu and Muslim India. The Pakistan Scheme does not imply that if Hindu India adopts the policy of oppressing its Muslim minorities, the Muslim States will oppress Hindu minorities in retaliation. If such a deplorable situation arises, it shall be the moral duty of the Muslim States to see that their non-Muslim minorities still continue undisturbed in the enjoyment of their special rights. They will still seek their strength in the united good will of the majority and minority peoples and will bring to bear their moral pressure on Hindu India through the fulfilment of their own minority obligations. In cases, however, where the majority in power will be absolutely callous to all moral appeals for the betterment of the lot of its minorities, force may be used as a last resort if the country interested in the fate of the minorities considers itself strong enough to take up their cause.

Babu Rajendra Prashad, however, thinks that once a country is declared sovereign and independent, it is free to manage its own internal affairs, as it likes and the minorities will have no

right to look for protection to any reciprocal consideration agreed upon with a neighbouring country. This is all true on paper, but in practice a government is bound in its treatment towards minorities to observe certain important considerations. Firstly, that its policy shall not drive the minorities to a state of exasperation, leading them on to open rebellion. Secondly, that its policy shall not transgress the rights secured to the minorities under safeguards. Thirdly, that public opinion in general shall support its policy on moral grounds: And finally, that its policy shall not involve the risk of entering into war with another country interested in the lot of minorities.

Babu Rajendra Prashad does not seem to have faith in any of these considerations and cites the instance that Muslim countries have never interfered in the past in the interest of Muslim minorities in other countries. This view however, is based upon superficial observation. None of the Muslim countries referred to by him is strong enough to interfere in the interests of Muslims elsewhere. The fear that this interference may involve it in war resulting in its own defeat has always exercised a strong deterrent effect on a Muslim country. Who can tacitly accept that Afghanistan is not moved at all when the Muslims in Tribal areas are unduly harassed by British authorities? What prevents her from actively siding with the cause of her Muslim brothers is the fear that the risk of interference may cause her own ruin by involving

her in war, with the whole might of the British Empire. If one or all of the Muslim countries had been First Class Powers on the line of certain Western nation, they would have never permitted millions of their co-religionists in other countries to remain content with a life of abject subjection.

History furnishes us many examples where countries have effectively interfered in the interest of the minorities in which they were interested. Czarist Russia always claimed to be the protector of Christian minorities in the former Turkish Empire while England and France on many occasions took up the cause of Copts in Egypt and Christians and Jews in Syria and Palestine.

It is a mere flight of imagination to suppose that once two countries become fully sovereign and independent, they become absolutely secure from the interference of one another and can pursue any policy they like towards their minorities irrespective of any consideration. Supposing the American minority in Shanghai is put to death by the Japanese, will not this provoke U.S.A. to an open war with Japan. The plea that both countries are independent and sovereign will not prevent one from interfering in the affairs of the other. Our Congress friends in India take shelter in legal fictions and phrases when they suit their interests and ignore that these are open to other interpretations than those conceived by them.

A typical instance of this is furnished where Babu Rajendra Prashad thinks that Pakistan and

Hindustan as separate independent States will be influenced by the intrigues of foreign powers and will be drawn into hostilities. If this fear can be considered a sufficient check to the creation of independent States, Europe should not have been split up into 26 national States and Hitler should have been given credit for his attempt to unify Europe under German domination with a view to save it from all future wars.

Does Babu Rajendra Prashad wish to make it a condition precedent to accepting the principle of Pakistan that the Muslim States should have no independent foreign policy of their own and that they should always be guided in their foreign relations at the sweet will of Hindu India? Muslims will be simple dupes if they can accept a new definition of independence at the dictation of Congress, which will practically reduce the Pakistan States to a position of subservience. Babu Rajendra Prashad has no right to know what will be the foreign policy of Pakistan just as Mr. Amery cannot bind down a free India to the foreign policy of Great Britain. Muslims want to live at peace and it is enough for B. Rajendra Prashad to know that Muslim States have never been aggressors in any war during the last 200 years.

The Ottoman Empire in Turkey, the Muslim States of Africa, Central Asia, Persia and Afghanistan have always been on the defensive and the various wars in which they were engaged and in which many of them lost their independence were

all inspired by ambitious designs on the part of European powers. In India, too, prior to the establishment of British rule, the Muslim States of Bengal Oudh, Rohilkhand, Karnatic, Hyderabad, Sindh and Mysore were never the aggressors in any war that was fought with the East India Company or the Mahrattas. Pakistan's foreign policy will too follow on the traditions of Muslim States in the past. It will be based upon two essential considerations. (1) collaboration with other States so as to form a strong barrier against Communism and Fascism and (2) pursuit of peaceful relations with all countries.

[III]

Babu Rajendra Prashad is anxious to know the resources of Pakistan, what shall be its future programme of development, how it will pursue its economic, exchange and currency policy. All these questions concern the people of Pakistan and nobody expects an outsider to look at these problems with genuine sympathy and a desire for their solution. Supposing for the sake of argument that Pakistan pursues an exclusive economic policy in the interest of its own people or does not possess enough resources to guarantee a life of plenty and prosperity for its people, can this be considered a sufficient reason to deprive the people of independence? The statesmen of Europe created a dozen new States on the termination of the last European war, but none of them cared to enquire what would

be their economic policy or programme of development. The principle that every important nationality concentrated in a compact part of a country had the right to exercise self-determination was conceded first and the details were worked out afterwards.

If economic or financial considerations had prevailed, Austria Hungary would have never been split up into half a dozen States and the various nationalities would have been federated into a common state with a federal government at the Centre. Similarly, the Baltic Provinces on the Western border of Czarist Russia had no justification for forming independent States, if economic or financial considerations had alone been the decisive factor. Europe, however, was then awakened to a new faith, a new creed and a new hope. It was to concede the right of self-determination to those minorities or peoples in Europe which had so far been deprived of it. Those minorities that occupied compact territories were assigned the status of independent states while their kinsmen who were still left as subject people in other States were considered as true minorities deserving of safeguards in the constitutions of their respective States. The Magyars in their homeland in that part of Hungary where they lived in a compact region were granted the status of a nation and their kinsmen in Rumania were assigned the rights of a minority.

On this principle which was extended to all the new states of Europe, the same nationality.

was a majority in one part of Europe enjoying the status of a sovereign state while it was treated as a minority in other parts of Europe. The Rumanians, the Poles the Yugo-Slavs, the Magyars, the Finns, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the Esthonians and the Austrians were majority peoples in the respective regions assigned to them but were treated as minorities in regions other than their own.

In so far as it was practically possible the minority question was settled in Europe once for all after the last war. Only such minorities were deprived of the status of independent nationalities as could not possibly be converted into majorities by a readjustment of geographical frontiers.

Before the last war, 80 millions of people in Central and North-Eastern Europe were considered as minorities whose interests were not properly defended in the countries of which they formed important parts. But almost all these minorities with the exception of Jews, who like Sikhs and Christians of India did not form a compact majority in any compact region, were given the status of independent nations. Poland, Czecho-Slovakia Austria, Hungary Finland, Esthonia, Latvia. Lithuania were recognised as sovereign States while Rumania and Serbia were enlarged to include their kindred peoples. By this arrangement, the former minorities of Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary were reduced from 80 millions to 20 millions or in other words, $\frac{1}{4}$ ths of the minorities.

were grouped into independent States and yet still remained minorities as before. In Poland, the Poles formed 66% of the population but there still lived 3½ million jews, a million Germans, and some millions of Russians.

If a statesman of Babu Rajendra Prashad's bent of mind had been given a position of authority in the framing of the Treaty of Versailles, he would have considered the settlement of minority problem, as devised after the last war, as no solution and would have straight away raised the issue. "So long as some 20 millions of Europeans have still to remain as minorities, it is no good to grant independence to 60 millions of them even though they occupy compact parts of Europe." According to him, 20 million Poles, 10 millions of Magyars, 7 millions of Austrians, the nationalities of the Baltic Region, the Rumanians, the Jugo-Slavs and the Czeco-Slovaks would not have deserved independence as many millions of their kindred people would have still to accept the lot of minorities.

Lest there be any doubt on this point, I refer to Babu Rajendra Prashad's statement in which he says, "One could have thought Pakistan suggested a solution of the communal problem. It does not touch that question at all as it leaves Muslim minorities in the so-called Hindu India and Hindu minorities in the so-called Pakistan as they are to-day".

This statement shows a deliberate misunderstanding of the whole minority problem of India.

The Pakistan Scheme provides national homelands in the Northern and Eastern zones of India for more than 2/3rd of Indian Muslims and reduces the Muslim minority of 90 millions to that of 25 millions under Hindu India, and yet Babu Rajendra Prashad has the hardihood to say that the Pakistan scheme does not touch the minority question at all! Even a fool can decide whether to choose full independence for 65 millions of his co-religionists or a permanent enslavement and subjection for 90 millions of them. Does Babu Rajendra Prashad suppose that Muslims do not understand what is vital to their own interests? Has he any other alternative proposal as a panacea for India's ills?

The Muslims have offered a workable proposition which alone is possible under the peculiar conditions of India. This proposition follows the lines that have been tried in Europe. It may not solve the communal problem in its entirety, but will minimise its importance and reduce it to the narrowest possible limits. The fact of Muslim minorities remaining in Hindu India and of Hindu minorities remaining in Muslim India cannot stand as a permanent bar in the way of giving trial to the Pakistan Scheme just as the existence of 20 millions of minorities in the new states of Europe created or enlarged after the last war, could not be considered sufficient argument for depriving these states of the right to self-determination.

If the Muslim States will have minorities, it will be solely because there is no other course open

to convert them into majorities. Similarly the Muslim minorities in Hindu India will have to suppress their aspiration, for independence simply because they are not entitled to claim independence on the principle of self-determination. A true minority, which is scattered over a country and does not muster strong in any compact part so as to form a majority, cannot claim independence on any modern test. Even if it is placed in power under a scheme of compromise, it cannot retain its power for long. Supposing the 12 per cent of Sikhs in the Punjab or 14 per cent of Muslims in the U.P. are put in power in their respective provinces. Shall they be able to retain it permanently? The answer to this question alone can decide whether minorities forming a part of the population in a Province can claim status of independent nationalities.

I now take up the second point in Mr. Jinnah's statement to which exception has been taken by Babu Rajendra Prashad in his rejoinder. Mr. Jinnah is reported to have said that the Congress is responsible for the failure of negotiations to arrive at a settlement and that the Congress position was most arrogant and dictatorial. Babu Rajendra Prashad himself admits that during the conversations which had taken place during the last three or four years between Mr. Jinnah and the representatives of the Congress, the two parties could never progress beyond the preliminary stage of setting their respective status and no concrete proposals for a settlement of the communal question arose.

On two occasions as stated by Mr. Jinnah, opportunities for a communal settlement were only frustrated by the refusal of the Congress to recognise the Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Muslims of India. Mr. Subhas Bose, in a letter dated October 2, 1938, addressed to Mr. Jinnah, definitely asserted that "the League does not expect the Congress to acknowledge its status as the authoritative Muslim organisation of India. If this view is accepted by the League, I am authorised to state the Working Committee will confer with the Committee that may be appointed by the League." On the second occasion when Babu Rajendra Prashad was the President of the Congress, the League was required to support the resolution of the Congress Working Committee concerning the demand for immediate independence of India and the declaration of the right of the people to frame their own constitution by means of a constituent assembly which was to be elected on the basis of adult franchise. But when the League put forth its claim for equal status with the Congress as a representative organ of Muslims, the Congress was unable to agree.

Babu Rajendra Prashad justifies this attitude of the Congress on the flimsy grounds (1) that the Working Committee of the Congress had received warnings against recognising the executive status of the League, (2) that there were other Muslim organisations functioning independently of the

League, so that some of them were staunch supporters of the Congress (3) and that there were individual Musalmans who were Congressmen and exercised no inconsiderable influence in the country.

Now this argument clearly implies that the Congress has withheld recognition from the Muslim League as an authoritative and representative organ of Muslims on the sole ground that it does not represent all classes of Muslims. Does not a similar argument apply to the Congress when it poses to stand for the interests of India as a whole and considers itself as the sole representative organ of India's political aspirations? If the League does not represent the Muslims of India as a whole, the Congress too does not represent Hindus as a whole not to say of the Muslims, the depressed classes, and the Indian Princes who do not recognise its authority. If it can be said that the Congress can claim support for its cause among a large number of Muslims, the same can be said for Muslim League which is supported by the minorities in general—the Depressed Classes, the Justice Party, the Christians and Anglo-Indians.

Mr. Amery has repeatedly refused to acknowledge Congress as the only party that counts in India, as he believes that the Congress wants an India to be governed by Congress for Congress on Congress lines. He challenges its representative character on the ground that it does not command the confidence of the League and other interests.

This is exactly the same argument as is used by the Congress in its dealings with the Muslim League.

If the Congress has the right to question the representative character of the Muslim League on the ground that it does not represent all Muslims the British Government has an equal right to assert that the Congress does not represent all classes of people in India.

The Congress holds the British Government responsible for not coming to terms with it and solving the present deadlock, but when the same allegation is laid by the Muslim League against the Congress for not coming to terms with it, the League is considered to blame. The Congress says to the Muslims, "present a united front and you will get all that you demand," but when the same advice is given to it by Mr. Amery, it loses its patience and threatens him with Civil Disobedience. The Muslims fail to understand the logic that guides the Congress mind. If the League cannot be recognised as an authoritative and representative body of Indian Muslims, why is the British Government asked to recognise the Congress as the authoritative and representative body of India as a whole? According to the Congress way of thinking both the League and Congress are unrepresentative in character and hence have no right to speak for the interests they claim to represent. The only remedy to remove this defect lies in the united efforts of the principal elements in India's population to present a common front.

A Communal Settlement alone is the prerequisite essential to the success of any negotiations with the British Government. The present deadlock will never be solved unless the Congress changes its attitude. The British Government wants it to frame a constitution in consultation with the Muslim League. The League on its part requests it to come to terms with it. The depressed classes have no confidence in Congress and have joined hands with the Muslim League. The Justice Party of Madras Presidency does not see eye to eye with Congress. The Indian Princes do not recognise its authority in their States. But still it takes its stand on the high plane of infallibility for its ideals and refuses to recognise justice in the voice of others. Does it not furnish a clear evidence that the Congress alone is responsible for the 'political dead-lock? Nothing but its arrogant and dictatorial position has prevented it so far from coming down to face realities.

3. *Sapru's Opposition to Pakistan.*

[1]

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in an article in the "Twentieth Century, under the caption "Mr. Amery and Bombay Conference," reminds the British Government of the importance of preserving India's geographical unity and expresses himself strongly against any scheme which aims at the dissection of India. In his earnestness to resolve the present political deadlock, he suggests to the British Government that it should enforce a new constitution based on India's political unity and offering safeguards to Muslims and other minorities

The article is written in a strain which seems to imply that it is primarily meant for the consumption of the British people. I take up those points in the article which bespeak of partisan spirit and deliberately misrepresent the Muslim case,

He thus starts, "I am glad that Mr. Amery referred to the history of the 18th century in India, for that is a period full of warnings to us. The analogy of the 18th century holds good and that should be a warning to the Hīndus and Muslims

alike." What Mr. Amery actually meant in his speech was that neither an India divided into a number of warring states, as it was on the decline of the Moghul Empire, nor again an India united at the dictation of Congress could maintain its independence without entering into partnership with the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The speech was a self-contradiction in terms as in one breath Mr. Amery deplored that "once broken up into separate and independent entities, India would relapse as it did in the decline of the Moghul Empire into a welter of contending powers." while in the other breath he warned the Congress that even a united India could not maintain her internal and external security without the British protection. To repeat his actual words, "Is that security which India First implies ever possible for India except in assured reliance upon some wide partnership?" Sir Tej Bahadur takes up the suggestion of Mr. Amery that partition will divide India into two hostile camps, but he has not a word to say on the warning which Mr. Amery administered to the Congress and on the dangers he pointed out in accepting Congress scheme of independence in the following words:—"The only solution of the moment, until we have got nearer to an agreement on principle, is one in which as individuals, the political leaders would keep the Viceroy's Executive uncommitted as regards the future constitution of India and without prejudice."

"These proposals were rejected out of hand by

the Congress, The attitude of the Congress in this matter is one of all or nothing. It means not merely unqualified recognition of India's independence but also independence of India governed by Congress on Congress lines. To accept that position or even to move towards it would at once create infinite trouble in India and would go far towards threatening all hopes of bringing about a self-governing India, united in some measure at any rate within itself."

In Sir Tej Bahadur's opinion, the Muslim League alone is responsible for the present deadlock while Congress and Hindu Mahasabha are prepared to offer a practical solution. What that practical solution is can be judged from the sweeping remarks of Sir Tej Bahadur against the League's Pakistan Scheme. If Muslims give up their demands for Pakistan and agree to live as a minority forming an integral part of India's population, Sir Tej Bahadur "would be prepared to go much farther than many other people in supporting any scheme" which could improve the position of minorities.

Muslims would welcome if Sir Tej Bahadur could offer a scheme as an alternative to Pakistan but they would never agree if a new constitution is enforced upon them without their consent. How can they expect that the liberal leader will be more generous towards them than the Congress, as he does not believe in a communal settlement as a prerequisite of any change in the

constitution and wants to force the hands of the British Government to frame a new constitution irrespective of the claims of the Muslim League whose leader in his opinion is a dictator and can never be appeased.

Sir Tej Bahadur asks. "who is going to keep peace between Muslim India and the rest of India, if India is divided into two hostile camps?" The British, he thinks, will have no concern nor any reason to interfere when Muslim India wants completely independent Muslim States and similarly other parts of India are to be equally independent. This makes clear that he conceives a scheme of Dominion Status in which India will be a partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations and will depend for its external and internal security upon the support of Great Britain. This line of argument is meant to win the British public opinion in the cause of India's unity.

Even Mahatma Gandhi has expressed a similar view when he said, "If the British leave India the Gurkhas and Punjabis from the north will overrun this country." This argument implies that complete independence for India is out of the question as the British army and navy will be needed to defend India's frontiers. The Muslim demand for the division of India into independent States is being opposed on the ground that the British army will no longer be available to interfere and extend its protecting hand.

If the aim before the liberal leader is the

continuance of India's connection with other members of the British Empire, this can be more readily achieved by a scheme of partition, and this for two reasons. India as a single unit will be too preponderant a partner in the British Commonwealth and will overshadow all other member states by its dominant voice, while in case of India's division into a number of self-governing States, Hindu India will not exercise a preponderant influence and the proper balance will be maintained between her and other member States. Further, as in the opinion of Sir Tej Bahadur there is bound to grow suspicion between Muslim States and Hindu India, the need of the British army will be felt till such time that mutual confidence, has been restored and thus the liberal leader's object of keeping the British army in India will be achieved.

The analogy of 18th century, which Sir Tej Bahadur has quoted from, Mr. Amery's speech does not hold good at present. India undoubtedly was broken up into a number of warring states on the decline of the Moghul empire, but it is ignored that the common people had no hand in the wars of the time which were dictated by the ambitions of Rajas and Nawabs who held absolute sway over their subjects. The conditions of the world have now entirely changed and the principle of selfdetermination has been accepted as a substitute for force. The present disruption of world peace is an abnormal phase in history and cannot be quoted as furnishing permanent principles for the future. On the analogy of Sir Tej

Bahadur, if it will be black treachery for the British to destroy the unity which their rule has created in India, it will be a black treachery for the German people if they break up Europe into separate states after they have succeeded in unifying it under their rule.

Sir Tej Bahadur admits that "whatever faults you may find with the British, there is no doubt that after Asoka's time, they are the only people who are able to evolve and maintain the geographical and political integrity of India." Will not a similar praise be offered to the German people if some one standing for the unity of Europe might say that, despite the faults of the German people, they have done one good to Europe and for the first time in history have created a real sense of political and geographical unity among the people? Even so the Ottomans in Turkey and the House of Hapsburg in the former Austro-Hungarian Empire had preserved the political and geographical integrity of their States; but no historian can yet be found to pay a glowing tribute to the Turks and Austrians for preserving the unity of their artificially contrived States. Everybody knows the Indian empire is a British conquest and its unity has been achieved at the point of the British bayonet. If the Muslim States of Bengal, Sindh, Oudh, or the Hindu States of India had been left to themselves, could they or their people have ever voluntarily agreed to merge into a bigger India and lose once for all their separate entities? It is a mere accident in history which has led to the unity of India at present, otherwise the

Hindus cannot conceive any period in history when India existed as a united country with its present bounds and limits.

Prior to the Muslim invasion, Northern India alone was split up into a number of warring Rajput States which seldom united for a common cause. Earlier than the Rajput period, under Harsha, Kanishka and Gupta Empires India as a whole was never a single political union. Asoka is probably the only king in history who through sheer conquest is said to have ruled India as a whole, but then he was a Buddhist king and his empire fell to pieces immediately after his death.

One fails to understand how it will be a black treachery if India is divided on the principle of self-determination. Was it an act of black treachery when in the postwar settlement of the last war, Czarist Russia, Austria-Hungary and Turkey were divided into a number of independent States? Could it be ever conceived that these new States would be constantly at war and destroy each other? If the rising power of Germany had not presented a new terror for Europe, these new States would have always lived at peace. A modern State yet in the stage of infancy has so many internal problems to solve that it will take years even centuries before it is fully organised to encroach upon a neighbouring country. Modern Germany was born in the 18th century, but it took it more than 200 years before it came to challenge and disturb the peace of Europe.

Hence the plea that the partition of India will lead to immediate war is all a figment of imagination. One may ask Sir Tej Bahadur if it was a black treachery when the Great Powers of Europe agreed in 1830 to guarantee the separation of Belgium which then formed an integral part of the Netherlands. Was it again a black treachery when the British recognised Ulster as a separate part of Ireland or when they agreed to separate Burma which had formed an integral part of India under the British rule?

[II]

Sir Tej Bahadur advances a political theory which is a pure concoction of his own imagination and unsupported by political experience when he says, "When it is apparent that two big organised parties have been carrying on domestic war under the inspiration of different ideas and when each one of them claims for its principles and resolutions the binding force of a creed, it is extremely dangerous to make agreement between them a prerequisite of any change in the constitution." He says, "what is to happen if they do not come to any agreement?" Let him find the answer in the following statement quoted from a great modern political philosopher.

Henry Sidgwick conceives that there are cases in which the true interests of the whole may be promoted by disruption. According to him if in

the portions of the same country, their respective inhabitants have divergent needs and demands in respect of legislation and other governmental interference on account of difference of caste, religion, past history or present social conditions, it is no longer desirable that they should have a common Government for internal affairs; while if at the same time their external relations apart from their union would be very different and there is danger that each part may lose more, by the risk of implications in other's quarrels than it is likely to gain from the aid of military force, complete separation is the only remedy. He says emphatically, that under such conditions as these, it is not to be desired that any sentiment of historical patriotism or any pride in the national ownership of an extensive territory, should prevent a peaceful dissolution of the incoherent whole into its natural parts."

When we say that a majority has the legal right to impose its decisions on a minority, we always have in mind a truly national state. Political experience of Europe and America knows of no minorities which are permanently at variance with majorities and are prepared to carry their differences to the point of separation.

Those who cite the American Civil War in support of preserving unity, even under the threat of war, forget the essential fact that in the U.S.A. differences arose among members of the same community allied in religion, language, culture, tradition

a majority in a continuous portion of its old State's territory.

Does Sir Tej Bahadur think that 175 years of British rule have created a coherent national State in India. If he sincerely believes this, why does he appeal to the British Government to frame a new constitution for the country instead of its being devised by the common consent of the people concerned. His very appeal, "Will Parliament abdicate its right or claim to frame any constitution for us?" is a clear confession that common agreement will never be possible in India. The Congress, too, when it presses its demand for complete independence and expresses inability to compose its difference with the Muslim League proves the existence of a deep cleavage which cannot be closed under any circumstances. The Bombay Conference and the statements of its Standing Committee and President, coupled with their threat to oppose tooth and nail the Muslim demand for Pakistan, have only added fuel to the fire and furnished Muslim another proof that there are bound to remain fundamental differences between them and the Hindus—who may be conveniently grouped into the Congress, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Liberal Federation—on questions concerning the future constitution. The Liberal opposition will further consolidate Muslim ranks and strengthen the hands of the League in presenting a united front.

Sir Tej Bahadur offers two criticisms against the demand for Pakistan which in his opinion was

given a definite shape at the Madras session. Firstly, he says, "It hardly occurred to the Speaker (Mr. Jinnah) there were others, particularly the minorities in those zones, who could say that they never agreed to it. Are they to be forced?"

Did it ever occur to Sir Tej Bahadur, when he appealed to the British Parliament to frame a constitution for India, that there were 90 millions of Muslims who would never agree to it? Could they be forced? He has definitely asserted that he can support any scheme which can better the lot of Muslims provided they remain as a minority and an integral part of India's population. Mr. Jinnah, too, has definitely asserted that the minorities in Pakistan will be assured of all safeguards which they will consider necessary for the protection of their religious, economic, social, cultural and political interests provided they agree to remain an integral part of Pakistan's population. If the Muslims in Hindu Provinces can agree to accept their lot as minorities, what prevents Hindus in Muslim provinces from accepting a similar position?

His second criticism is, "And what is to happen to the very appreciable number of Muslims outside these independent States in the north-west and eastern zones of India? Are they to take apprehended risks of submission to the majority rule of Hindus for the sake of Muslim majorities in these two favoured parts of India?" Here again we may ask Sir Tej Bahadur, if one-third of Indian

Muslims are to remain as minorities in a scheme of partition, will it offer a better alternative if all of them, in their full strength, are to accept a minority status in India as it is at present? If for the sake of the idea of a united Indian nation, 90 millions of Muslims can be persuaded to take risks of submission to the majority rule of Hindus, there is no reason why 30 millions of them should not take a similar risk, when there is the additional consolation to them that 60 millions of their brothers will be in full political power in their two independent States.

The history of Europe shows that minorities enjoyed greater protection when their kinsmen held power in some independent States than when they merely depended on the safeguards of their own constitution.

The case of Sudetan Germans clearly proved that their rights as a minority were carefully protected because of the moral support that they found in Germany. Similarly, the rights of Muslim minorities in Hindu India will be carefully protected, once two independent States come into power as the latter will be able to give them full moral support.

As a matter of fact, the question of risks for minorities does not arise in a scheme of partition as their rights will be safeguarded on a reciprocal basis. Dr. Ambedkar in his "Thoughts on Pakistan" repudiates in strong terms the oft-repeated argument of Hindus that Pakistan does

not offer a solution of the Communal Problem. He invites attention (1) to the effect of Pakistan on magnitude of the communal problem (2) and to its effect on communal representation in the Central Legislature. Under the Pakistan scheme, there will be, according to him, 48 millions of Muslims in their independent states and $18\frac{1}{2}$ millions in Hindu India. He then draws the conclusion, "that while without Pakistan, the communal problem involves $6\frac{1}{2}$ crores of Muslims, after Pakistan it will involve only 2 crores of Muslims. Is this to be no consideration for Hindus who want communal peace? Similarly after Pakistan the Muslim representation in the Central Legislature will be reduced from 33 per cent at present to 20 per cent in Hindu India. Dr. Ambedkar thus appreciates this result, "To me it appears that it is a great improvement in the position of Hindus at the centre which would never come to them if they oppose the result."

4. *The North-West Frontier Bogey.*

Mr. Sanadhi, a Madrasi Hindu, while criticising in the January issue of 'Federated India' the views expressed by Mr. Patrick Lacey in the 'Contemporary Review' in support of his suggestion for the creating of two Indias, exposes his real nature and makes some sweeping remarks which are utterly untenable. There is no justification for his assertion that "the Pathan is always against Hindu prosperity and power." nor is he on his moral grounds when he says. "It would not do therefore to give a fillip to the unruly tribes thus by creating a zone entirely under a Muslim State, though in letter subordinate to the British sovereignty. "His Mental derangement becomes apparent when he expresses the fear that once the N.W.F.P. "is made part of Pakistan, the Hindus cannot have peace" and then as a remedy he suggests that the India's Land Gate way and Political Sore should be under the jurisdiction, civil and military, of a Body in which the Hindus should be in the majority."

These remarks, from a Hindu whose avowed sympathies are with the Congress, must come as a shock to the Congressite Muslims of the N. W. F. Province who have been the staunch supporters of Congress so far. Mr. Sanadhi is not the first Hindu

who has played upon the fears of the Hindu mind against a possible danger from the Pathans. Mahatma Gandhi in an article in the "Harijan" expressed the same idea when he wrote, "Consider for one moment what can happen if the English were to withdraw all of a sudden and there was no foreign usurper to rule. It may be said that the Punjabis, be they Muslims, Sikhs or others, will overrun India."

It has been the favourite theme of all prominent Hindu leaders to stir up the feelings of their community by the bogey of the Frontier danger. This serves their sinister motives in many ways. Firstly, the British Government is reminded of the need of pursuing a strong policy against the Frontier people, and tribes. Secondly, the Hindu minority in the Frontier Province, which is in reality the most aggressive element in the Hindu community, is encouraged and emboldened in its pursuit of its baneful activities and in extorting concessions from the Frontier Government at the expense of Muslims. Lastly, by an appeal to the historic fears of the Hindus that the N. W. F. Province has been a source of danger in the past, a sense of political unity is created among them to prevent the Muslims from coming into power in any part of India.

A careful examination of the Frontier Question will prove that the Hindu fears are absolutely groundless. The N.W.F. Province no longer retains the same importance that it once held in the past.

The danger to the security of India lies not so much in her land frontiers as in her long coastline. India is now exposed to an invasion by sea from Japan or a European power hostile to Great Britain. Her real frontiers have been extended as far as Singapore in the East and the Suez Canal in the West.

If, however, it is still conceded that the Frontier Province is a danger zone, then the menace to India's security can no longer be expected from the Tribal Areas or Afghanistan, but from Soviet Russia which is seeking access to the Sea southwards and is coveting the sea-ports on the Persian Gulf. The Muslim countries of Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan, even when united, cannot successfully ward off a Russian invasion without the assistance of Great Britain. If these countries had any sinister designs on India, now was the opportunity for them to create trouble as the British Empire is involved in a life and death struggle for its very existence. But their friendly relations with Great Britain, and their mutual pacts of alliance against a possible threat to their integrity from Russia or any other quarter clearly reveal that their attitude is one of defence and self-preservation.

Those who find in Afghanistan of to-day the same urge for expansion and conquest as was the characteristic of this country in the past are utterly mistaken: Afghanistan's present position is that of a buffer State between two Imperial Powers and it cannot dare to displease either. In the past,

Afghanistan freely drew upon the resources of Central Asia, which was then the breeding place of the most warlike races of Islam; but since this vast country has been subjected to Russian rule, the people have been entirely disarmed and lost touch with their military traditions.

Moreover, wars in the past were decided by a mere display of superior physical strength and enthusiasm; population then never counted as a source of real strength. Modern wars depend upon a deliberate study of science and a number of other factors which were unknown in the past. Of the two countries, with a similar standard of civilisation, the one which has a greater knowledge of science and greater resources in man power and natural wealth is sure to win. In the conflict between Germany and France, the former was bound to triumph, as it could bring to bear the full weight of her resources upon France which is half as much as Germany in population. A Hindu India awakened to its full political consciousness stands in no danger from Afghanistan. This also refutes the idea that Pakistan is meant to be used as a weapon against Hindus who cannot defend their independence.

Chances of conflict, however, are bound to occur on the Frontier if a policy is pursued in administration deliberately inimical to the interests of the original inhabitants. The Frontier Province has a population of 5 millions including the Tribal areas, with a Hindu minority of a quarter of a

million. These Hindus are not the original inhabitants of this area. They do not claim the same descent, religion, language, or culture as the Pathans. They have in fact settled there mainly in cities during the British rule as traders, shopkeepers and money-lenders. In some cities like Bannu, the Hindu element is predominant. The general impression about the economic position of the two communities is that the Hindus possess wealth and property out of proportion to their numerical strength, and hold a privileged position in trade and services. Muslim farmers and labourers toil hard to manage a marginal existence, but the Hindus prosper and thrive on the fruits of their labour.

This unequal distribution of economic facilities has forced more and more Muslims to migrate from cities to villages to be thrown on the meagre resources of their land. There is no vocation in which the Pathans can compete on equal terms with the Hindu and so their middle classes have been practically ruined. This is the reason why in almost all the cities and villages, the internal trade is entirely carried on by Hindus.

The Frontier Problem is at the bottom a political and economic problem. The pathans love independence and cannot tolerate interference with their tribal life. They are conscious of the fact that their kith and kin in Afghanistan enjoy perfect independence under a Muslim King while they are not allowed to retain even the ordinary political rights

to which they have been traditionally accustomed. The British Government is constantly moving to advance her frontiers and thereby increase her power and prestige among the independent tribes. Hence conflicts arise frequently. The economic question is also very acute. The tribesmen have been forced to retire into the barren interior of the Frontier Province while the fertile parts lie within the British jurisdiction. Their very sense of self-preservation moves them from time to time to make inroads upon British territory and to rob and plunder the people. They make no discrimination between a Hindu or a Muslim when they commit an act of brigandage. The Congress leaders have often said that if they were allowed to visit the Tribal Areas, they could win over the tribes in no time and establish peace and friendly relations between them and their neighbours. If their political sentiment is satisfied and they are assured of economic advantages, they will cease to disturb the peace of the settled districts.

It is a slur upon the fair name of the Pathan to say that he is always against Hindu prosperity and power. The Hindu has made a huge fortune for himself in Afghanistan and the Frontier Province. He owns exchange banks in Kabul and Kandhar, monopolises the entire carrying trade and pursues his trade in peace in the remotest frontier villages. All this tends to prove the peaceful intentions of the Pathan. But for his toleration, goodwill and fairmindedness the Hindu would not have been permitted to dominate the urban element in all the cities and to exploit the resources of

country. Political consciousness is now forcing him to take a due share in the wealth of his country. If he agitates for the restoration of his economic rights or if he starts a Buy Muslim campaign, that does not imply that he is against Hindu prosperity and power. The Hindus being a foreign element in the population, and a drain on its economic life, naturally the Pathan has a right to question the old economic system under which he finds the doors of trade and shopkeeping closed to him.

The suggestion that the Hindu should have a dominant voice in the civil and military administration of the Frontier Province, if he is to live at peace, is absurd, immoral and undemocratic. There is no method known to constitutional practice which can convert a minority of $2\frac{1}{2}$ lacs into a majority so as to possess greater rights than 50 lacs of Muslims.

Granted it may be enforced under a future Congress Government. But will it ensure peace to the Hindus? The Pathan is the last person to bow down before coercion and threat to his independence. He knows how to retaliate. The safety and peaceful life of the Hindus lies in their refraining from all political intrigues which may bring down upon them the wrath of their Muslim neighbours. If ever the Pathan realises seriously that the Hindu wants to make his Province a subservient part of India to be governed in the interest of the Hindu minority, he will be forced to adopt the same

methods against the Frontier Hindus as were employed by the Turks against the Armenians when they suspected them of playing into the hands of foreign agents.

Unfortunately, the Pathans have been duped at present by a false sense of exaltation which their great leader Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan enjoys in Congress ranks. Mahatma Gandhi is shrewd enough to humour the Frontier Gandhi, and consults him on all matters of high policy.

The stress laid on *non-violence* may have been really designed to shatter the Pathan's belief in violence and thereby disarm him and minimise his importance as a military factor. There could be no better method of overcoming the possible Frontier danger than by converting a powerful section of the Pathans to the Gandhian philosophy.

The best way to destroy one's enemy is to lure him to a false sense of security and then to kill him outright when a favourable opportunity presents itself. By enlisting the Pathans as camp followers of Congress, Gandhi has done a great service to the Hindu community. He has taken the first step in dispelling their historic fears that the Frontier is a danger zone for India.

5 *Radhakrishnan on Unity*

In his convocation address to the students of the Dacca University Sir S. Radhakrishnan repeated the same arguments that so often have been advanced on the political platform of Congress and have been openly challenged by the Muslim League. He snatched isolated instances from history to prove that India is an indivisible unit and pleaded for India's unification on the grounds that "economically the different parts are interdependent," that "we are all faced by the same economic and social disabilities," that we all face a common peril. that the faith of Islam is not hostile to the traditional policy of racial and religious fellowship. and that the problems facing us are neither Hindu nor Muslim but Indian. I will take up in this article the main argument in support of India's political unity in the past to prove what it is worth for.

Throughout the Hindu period in History which according to Sir Radhakrishnan is said to have commenced from fourth millenium B.C. and lasted down to the conquest of India by Muslims in 1200 A.D. during a span of over 5,000 years, India never existed with its present bounds and limits except for a short period under the Empire of Asoka. Even then the empire was a result of conquest and not of the natural desire on the part

of the then independent kingdoms to unite. When Asoka conquered Talinga, a Hindu state in the South he had to wade through a river of blood, and it is said that more than a hundred thousand people were killed and even a greater number were led into captivity. The sight of bloodshed impressed the King so much that thenceforth he discarded Hinduism and became a convert to Buddhism. This single incident is quite sufficient to prove how far the unity of India under Asoka was based on the goodwill of the people. Asoka's new faith and pious life as a faithful follower of Buddhism did not leave a permanent effect. The empire did not survive its founder and was split up into pieces after his death.

Even yet there is no unanimity among the historians that Asoka's empire included the whole of present India. The extent can only be traced, in the absence of any other authentic record from the edicts which he caused to be engraved on stone pillars. Some of the Asokan inscriptions have been discovered near Peshawar, in the Himalayas, in Bengal and in Mysore. But one historian does not accept this evidence as pointing out towards the extent of Asoka's empire in the following words; "May we conclude from the existence of these remains that the sway of Asoka extended over all the country marked out by them? Did his empire include Afghanistan, a part of Kashmir and Nepal, and the whole of India save the southern extremity? The inference is doubtful. The zeal of the missionaries of the Buddhist monarch is known to

have outrun the boundaries of his kingdom, and they may have engraved these inscriptions on the rocks of solitudes that did not own the sway of their Imperial Master." Finally this historian concludes that Asoka's authority over the remote districts within the area was only of a loose and light order and that "he ruled over a larger area than was governed by any monarch of India before the Mughals." Those who know that the Moghal Empire even at the height of its power under Aurangzeb did not include parts of India south of the Deccan and that the Muslim kings before the Moghals did not rule over the southern half of India, as well as Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Eastern Bengal and Assam, can well imagine the extent of Asoka's empire.

I quote from the evidence of another historian on the efforts made by the Hindu Kings in the past to establish India's unity. P. E. Roberts writes in the History of British India, "No lasting imperial dominion in India was ever established by a Hindu people, though on three occasions such an event appeared to come within the bounds of probability. The short-lived empire of Asoka is supposed by some authorities to have extended from the Hindu Kush mountains to approximately the northern frontier of Mysore. Again, Samudragupta of Patliputra, A.D. 400, and Harsha of Kanauj, about 200 years later, extended their suzerainty over a great part of northern India, but neither founded a lasting dynasty.'

Turning to ancient times, prior to the invasion of Alexander the Great during a period extending over 4,000 years, we find that India was "parcelled out, like Palestine and Greece, into a number of small kingdoms, each under the government of its own Raja." The earliest traditions of India as recorded in Mahabharata and Ramayana speak of a period of constant war among the numerous small kingdoms that made up the country at the time.

Even prior to Muslim invasion of India, during a long period of history extending over 600 years, which is known as the Rajput period, India was split up into a number of independent states and principalities often at war with one another. The threat of common danger from foreign invaders never acted as a permanent unifying force in the past.

If the people of India had united during the long span of 5,000 years under a central Hindu Kingdom on a lasting basis, the series of foreign invasions that were a distinctive feature of the history of India in the past would have never disturbed the peace of this vast sub-continent. The Persians, the Greeks, the Parthians, the Scythians, the Kushans and later on the Arabs, the Pathans and the Mughals had each in turn to contend against individual states or a group of states loosely united for the time being.

At the time of Alexander's invasion, the Punjab was split up into a number of states and so could not offer an effective resistance against the

foreign invader. When the Arabs came in the 8th century, they wrested Sind from its reigning Hindu Raja. Later on Mahmud of Ghazni made a series of invasions but he met with no organised Hindu resistance under a central Hindu Empire. The same story was repeated when Shahabud-Din Ghorî invaded. The various Rajput kingdoms were separated from one another by the dynastic jealousies of their Rajas, and could not unite on definite lines for defence against the common danger.

Even in later times on the decline of the Moghal Empire, when the Mahrattas had raised the standard of revolt for the liberation of India from Moghal domination, the Hindu sense of unity instead of being awakened from the rude shock that it had suffered in the third battle of Panipat, was further frittered away under the States of Mahratta confederacy, each of which pulled on independently of the other. If the British had not entered the field at this time, the so-called unity of India would have remained a pious dream, and India would have been parcelled out into a number of independent kingdoms.

Those who argue that the Mahrattas would have succeeded in establishing India's political unity, overlook the insurmountable difficulties that lay in their way. The Muslim State of Mysore in the south, the Sikhs in the Punjab, and the Rajputs in Rajputana were too strongly entrenched to be forced to acknowledge Mahratta sway. Moreover, the Mahratta Confederacy

RADHAKRISHNAN ON UNITY

had grown weak on account of the ambitions of the Confederating Chiefs. There was no guarantee that the Confederacy would remain united for the achievement of India's political unity. Holkar and Sindhia were, real rivals of power. At the utmost, even if Muslim and Sikh opposition is minimised, it can be safely said that the Maharatta Confederacy would have finally succeeded in splitting up India into 5 separate sovereign States. The Maharashtra, Baroda, the Central Provinces, Indore and Gwalior each, would have been an independent State under the Peshwas, Gaikwars, Bhonslas, Holkars and Sindhias respectively, and the rest of India might have been parcelled out among them in proportion to their respective strength. But this would have not yet solved the problem of India's political unity though Hindus might have been gratified to reckon to their account five independent Hindu States and further sought satisfaction in the permanent domination of Muslim parts of India.

In view of the clear verdict of history that India was near a single political unit during the long period of 5,000 years prior to the Muslim invasion, it is preposterous to suggest that India is an indivisible unit. Under the Muslims, for the first time, an attempt was made to establish a Central Empire on a lasting footing, and the Khiljis, Tughluks and Moghuls did succeed in extending their sway over the whole of India except the extreme south, but the Muslim empire owed its existence to the imperial ambitions

of the reigning dynasties and not to organised support on the part of their subjects. In fact, it will be true to say that India's unity under the Muslim Kings was maintained under the threat of arms and Hindu subjects never missed an opportunity to rise in revolt if they felt themselves strong enough to bear arms and force their terms.

The same can be said of India's unity under the British. The people would have risen in arms against the British, as they did at the time of the Indian Mutiny, but for the superior military power of the ruling nation which has held in check the turbulent elements in the population and forced the people in general to pursue a peaceful life.

All talk of India's integrity, indivisibility and unity is a recent development. The Hindu conception in the past was limited to kingships of an autocratic type. The Raja held supreme political power and recognised none superior to himself in the State. The Ramayana and Mahabharata describe an India which was parcelled out into numerous independent monarchies. The Rajput period prior to the Muslim invasion represents the same picture. The Mauryas' attempt to found a central empire for the whole of India did not meet with lasting success, while no other Hindu Raja was able to rule more than two-thirds of Northern India. Kingship was the order of the day while the empire was an exception. It is

only under the British influence that for the first time Hindus have dreamt of India's political unity. The consciousness among Hindus that they are one by religion and culture and that in the past their weakness lay in their political divisions has led them to aspire for unity. They have been encouraged in their new aspirations by the example of new nations in Europe. Nationalism has given a new force to popular movements in other countries and Hinduism was bound to be influenced by it.

But Hindu nationalists have failed to recognise that nationalism is both a unifying and a disruptive force. It unites people in a homogeneous State where there is no clash of religion and culture, but it disintegrates a non-homogeneous State into its natural parts where people are not united by common ties of race, religion, language and history. Thus while Germany and Italy were unified in Europe in the nine-teenth century, smaller nations in Central and Eastern Europe seceded from the bigger States of which they formed integral parts. The Balkan Peninsula, Central Europe and western parts of Russia gave birth to a number of new States. The emphasis on nationalism is bound to break up India into separate States.

It is the essence of nationalism that the right of every group, whether big or small, has to be recognised for independent existence. A group cannot be deprived of its independence simply

because its independence will bring it into conflict with a neighbour or that it will not be able to defend its frontiers from aggression. Nor again the argument that union with a large group will be more advantageous to it or to the two groups separately or combined can be a sufficient inducement to the group to give up its right to self-determination if it thinks that separation alone will satisfy its national pride. If nationalism denies the right to determine its future to another nation which is conscious of its own political and historical role, it gives place to Imperialism which seeks expansion at the expense of others.

Mere insistence on India's unity without recognising the rights of Muslims who are numerically stronger than every other great nation except Russia or U.S.A., is to betray lack of understanding of the real problem that faces India today. India forced into a union against the will of 90 millions of Muslims will be like a house divided against itself and will invite aggression from outside. Political unity, to be effective and lasting, must be based on the goodwill and support of all those who live within the bounds of India. If it is not desired by a powerful element which numbers one-fourth of the population and forms a distinct majority in two separate regions of India, of well-marked limits, only a Government with an Imperialistic policy and programme can find measures to enforce it. The right to secession is as much the sacred right of a compact community within a state provided it is

Strong enough to gain recognition for its demands, as it is the right of a nation to determine its own form of government.

The Indian problem is an inter-national problem and it cannot be solved on the principle of one nation for one-fifth part of humanity. The notion of India's unity is the dream of the Imperialist which will never come true. The days of empires are over. No Asoka or Akbar can command the allegiance of 400 millions of people as subjects of a common empire,

The example of the British Empire furnishes no parallel. The British Crown no doubt reigns supreme over one-fourth part of the world, and reckons among its subjects more than 500 millions of peoples but its real strength is based upon the resources of the British nation. The empire is held together by the dominant position which Great Britain occupies.

6. *Will Freedom Lead to Unity ?*

To mislead British Public opinion, Hindu leaders have often declared in their public statements and speeches that political advance could not be denied to India simply because Hindus and Muslims cannot reconcile their differences and that the declaration of complete independence, which is interpreted by them as equivalent to the grant of Dominion Status, will lead to the unity of the people of India. In support of this argument, the examples of British self-governing Dominions are cited and the British Government is reminded that it never insisted on consent as a condition precedent for the grant of Dominion Status in case of Canada, South Africa, Australia and Ireland.

Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarkar, a prominent Hindu leader of Bengal, and a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, thus defended the Hindu case in an interview which he granted to pressmen in Calcutta on the eve of his taking over charge of his new post on October 13, 1941; "The monotonous insistence in London of perfect internal unity among all the different elements of national life, preliminary to any constitutional advance was naturally rather irritating to Indian feelings", Unity, be admitted, was a precious asset. But was it ever a pre-requisite to the grant of freedom in any

Country? If so, South Africa could not have got her freedom 40 years ago, neither could freedom be given to the many European countries under Nazi occupation whose freedom England had solemnly pledged to restore. Was there perfect internal unity in Ireland? Was China so united that her freedom should be guaranteed by British and America? Perfect internal unity thus, though not an essential pre-requisite to political freedom, was no doubt necessary for the effective preservation of the freedom of a nation when this freedom was achieved. Mr. Sarkar concluded his statement with the prophetic assertion that "freedom itself is a vital and deciding factor towards the achievement of unity and that history has taught us that freedom will lead to unity."

An attempt will be made to expose the fallacious nature of this line of argument and to lay bare the motives that inspire the Hindu mind. I take up first the main argument that freedom leads to unity. In a country which is inhabited by a homogeneous people allied together by ties of a common religion, race, language and culture and temporarily under the occupation of one or more foreign powers, freedom will undoubtedly lead to unity as was the case of Italy in the 19th century and of Poland after the last war.

Italy was broken up into a number of petty states and principalities, each with its own Duke or Prince while the Emperor of Austria and the Pope held important parts under their sway. The people

were culturally one and were conscious of their common heritage and their heroic past. They had been roused from their torpor and lethargy by the stirring appeals of Mazzini who was held in the highest esteem by the Italians of all classes. There was no tendency in any section of the population for the separation of any part. Nor there was any important political organization which questioned the leadership of Mazzini. The latter's own description of the Italian people shows them in marked contrast with the people of India. Mazzini wrote in 1845, "We are a people of from one and twenty to two and twenty millions of men, known from time immemorial by the same name, as the people of Italy, speaking the same language, modified by dialects varying from each other less than do the Scotch and the English; having the same creed, the same manners, the same habits, proud of the noblest tradition in politics, science and art, that adorns European history; having twice given to humanity a tie, a watchword of Unity—once in the Rome of Emperors, again, ere they had betrayed their mission, in the Rome of the Popes."

To compare with this description of Italy, I reproduce here the picture of India drawn by Lord Dufferin in 1887. "This population is composed of a large number of distinct nationalities, professing various religions, practising diverse rites, speaking different languages, while many of them are still further separated from one another by discordant prejudices, by conflicting sources of usages, and even

antagonistic material interests. But perhaps the most potent characteristic of our Indian cosmos is the division into two mighty political communities as distant from each other as poles asunder in their religious faith, their social organization and their natural aptitudes, on the one hand the Hindu numbering 190 millions, with their polytheistic beliefs, their temples adorned with images and idols, their veneration for the sacred cow, their elaborate caste distinction to successive conquerors—on the other hand, the Mohomedans, a nation of 50 millions, with their monotheism their iconoclastic fanaticism, their animal sacrifices, their social equality, and their remembrance of the days when, enthroned at Delhi, they reigned supreme from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin.” A contrast of Italy with India reveals that whereas Italy had attained complete cultural unity before it aspired for freedom, India still lacks cultural unity and vainly hopes that political unity alone will unite the people on a permanent basis.

Poland too lacked political unity prior to its independence after the last Great War. The country had been split up into three parts, which were included in the former Russian, Austro-Hungarian and German Empires respectively, but as the people were one by religion, race, culture and history, hence the grant of freedom on the collapse of the three empires led to the achievement of complete unity. History is replete with examples which show that cultural unity of a people is an essential prerequisite to their political unity or

what is called in popular language "freedom."

Countries in which the inhabitants have lacked cultural unity have always disintegrated into parts when they had to face some great crisis. The examples of Czarist Russia, Hapsburg Empire of Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire prior to the last Great War clearly illustrate this. These countries were united under ties of political unity as represented by their reigning dynasties, but their inhabitants differed on cultural, racial and religious grounds. Grant of freedom to them on the collapse of the empires under which they lived meant the freedom of each nationality to determine its own future. Instead of leading towards the achievement of unity, freedom led to the dismemberment of these countries into their natural parts. The minorities occupying compact territories were converted into majorities and recognised as independent nations. Thus the Finns, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians and Poles, former minorities of Czarist Russia, formed their own national States. Similarly, the minorities of Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Czechs and Slovaks, the Serbs and Croats, the Magyars, and the Austrians were conceded the right of self-determination.

India's case falls into line with non-homogeneous countries which lack cultural unity. Freedom will not lead towards the achievement of political unity but towards its disintegration into parts, on the principle of self-determination. It is absolutely wrong to say that the mere grant of

freedom to a country, divided on cultural grounds will help effectively to preserve unity. Where unity does not exist, freedom will only hasten the process of disintegration. If the British were to withdraw their armies from India to-day, the country will be plunged into a civil war where one community will be ranged against the other. The struggle for political power and the opportunities which political power confers is alone responsible for the present communal tension. Unless the political differences are adjusted by mutual consent and an agreed constitution can be devised for the future, mere declaration of freedom on the part of British Government will do no good.

It is for this reason that the Muslim League insists on consent as a pre-requisite to the grant of freedom. Muslims are not opposed on principle to the independence of India, but they are not prepared to accept a constitution which will reduce them to the position of an insignificant minority. If the Hindus are really keen for independence, they should satisfy the Muslims as to how this independence will turn to their advantage in a scheme of united India. The Muslims, will not be a party to any compromise which will lead to the formation of what is called a national government at the centre, responsible to a Legislature. They have made it clear that they are a separate nation, and that they cannot accept any scheme of government which places the Hindu majority in permanent possession of power.

The present political dead-lock clearly proves that the two major communities have fundamental differences in regard to the form of government under which they want to live. The Hindus want on the pretence of India's unity, integrity and indivisibility to keep under permanent subjection the two distinct Muslim Zones in the north-west and north-east of India. They argue their case as if India were the home of a united nation which simply needs independence to complete the process of unity. On the other hand, Muslims claim the partition of India on the principle of self-determination and do not want to lose their separate political identity. In face of such insurmountable political differences, it is futile to ask the British Government to declare India's independence and to establish so-called national government at the centre. The League is committed to its creed of Pakistan, while the Congress to a Federal Government on a unitary basis. The Muslims know that if they accept a government at the centre, responsible to an elected legislature, they will be striking at the root of their own political goal and be strengthening the Hindu scheme for the domination of India as a whole. Political expediency demands that in a non-homogeneous country, where political differences have reached a stage making compromise impossibly except on the principle of self-determination for each community occupying a compact part of the country, no efforts should be made to

enforce a constitution which is strongly opposed by an important nationality,

But it is very unfortunate that in India prominent Hindu leaders have formed a clique to mislead the British Government in regard to the political aspirations of the Muslims and to force its hands to establish a government at the centre, national in appearance but utterly aggressive and communal in actual practice. To quote Mr. Jayakar's own words, who said in a speech at Dhariwar on October 8, "a compromise formula is possible on the basis of Britain making a definite promise of full Dominion Status within a fixed period after the termination of the war and establishing a national government at the centre with non-officials who enjoy public esteem and confidence, selected by the Viceroy". The Muslims see through the game. They are not opposed to the grant of Dominion Status but they cannot accept a national government which is established on the principle that India is the home of a single nation. If the Muslims are assured of a 50% representation on the Viceroy's Council during the war, as representatives of a nation on terms of equality with Hindus, then alone this compromise formula could make its appeal to them. It is, however, irritating and galling to their pride when they find Hindu politicians lecturing to the British Government that consent should never be insisted on as a preliminary to the grant of freedom and that the framing of the constitution should not be left entirely in Indian hands, as differences cannot be reconciled.

In one breath these Hindu Leaders assert that freedom will lead to India's unity and that these internal differences will disappear after a national government has been established, but in the other breath they remind the British Government that Congress-League differences cannot be reconciled and that it is useless to insist on consent as a prerequisite to the grant of freedom. The Hindu leaders try to deceive the Muslims by couching their arguments in a hypocritical language, not easily intelligible to laymen, but in reality they want no compromise with the Muslim League and seek, instead, a direct agreement with the British Government to enforce their own demands.' All talk of complete independence for India will vanish if the the British Government were to openly declare that they do not recognise the Muslim League as the spokesman of the Muslims and were ready to come to terms with the Congress as the only national organisation of India.

There are signs that if the Muslim demand for Pakistan is finally rejected by the British Government, the Congress and all other Hindu organisations will be quite willing to revise their present policies and to conclude a gentleman's agreement. The Hindu Mahasabha's active co-operation with the Viceroy and Mr. Savarkar's appeals for militarisation of Hindus were inspired by similar motives. The Mahasabha had held out the threat of direct action against the British Government in India if their demand for independence was not accepted, but immediately on Mr. Amrey's using

some harsh words in condemnation of Pakistan, the Mahasabha began to reverse its policy and offered full co-operation. The selection of Messrs, Anney and N. R. Sirkar as members of the Viceroy's Council, both of whom have been strong opponents of Pakistan, was really a step to appease the Hindu Mahasabha. It has often been asserted in the Hindu press that if Congress had not retired into wilderness and instead pursued its parliamentary programme in the Centre and provinces, the League would never have gained its present strength and importance and the demand for Pakistan would have never raised its ugly head. It is truly the characteristic of a non-homogeneous State that the political awakening and progress of one community are the cause of jealousy and bitterness on the part of the other.